

A  
R E P L Y

To the Reverend  
Dean of St. *PAULS*'s Reflections  
O N T H E  
R E C T O R of S U T T O N, &c.

WHEREIN

The Principles and Practices of the Non-conformists are not only vindicated by *Scripture*, but by Dr. *Stillingfleet's Rational Account*, as well as his *Irenicum*; as also by the Writings of the Lord *Faulkland*, Mr. *Hales*, Mr. *Ghillingworth*, &c.

---

By the same Hand.

*John Barrett - ac*

---

To which is added,

St. Paul's Work Promoted ;

O R,

Proper Materials drawn from *The true and only way of Concord*, and *Pleas for Peace*, and other late Writings of Mr. *Richard Baxter*, for uniting Protestant Dissenters, and repairing a Divided Church.

---

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. to be Sold by *Richard Janeway*, in Queens-Head Alley in *Pater-noster-Row*, 1681.

# REPORT

of the

...

...

...

...

...

...

...



# REPLY

To the Reverend

DEAN of St. PAULS's

## REFLECTIONS

ON THE

RECTOR of SUTTON, &c.

**N**OW thanks (Sir) for your Token; I would have said *New-Years-Gift*, had it come about a Fortnight sooner. Some told me lately an Answer was coming forth to my Notes upon the Doctor's Sermon; but I could not imagin how I should have a fair and just Answer from him, without his putting forth *another Edition* of his *Irenicum*, (and it must be *Another* indeed, quite different from the former;) or else giving us an *Index Expurgatorius* to the former, that we may know what he would have expunged; or (which would have been most satisfactory, and not unreasonable) his publishing a *Book of Retractions*, shewing in what Particulars, and upon what Grounds and Reasons his Mind is since changed.

Upon the perusal of this Voluminous Writing of his, which must pass for a *Confutation* of his Five Answerers; I can find so little or nothing said to me, that were it not for *Three Conclusions* he lays down in his *Preface*, (p. 72, 73.) and *Three Letters*, which for my sake, upon account of what I had said (as it seems *Preface* pag. 76.) he annexeth as an *Appendix*, at the End of his Book, I should not have thought my self concerned to make any Reply.

I cannot find, that ever he vouchsafes to take notice of so much as one of my *Twelve Queries*, which ( though I remember they were written in great haste, yet ) some of them ( I think ) are pinching.

My *First Query* ( to name no more ) wise, impartial Men think it would have been an Act of *Justice* and *Honesty*, as well as of *Charity*, *Ingenuity*, *Self-denial*, for him to have well considered, and to have given a serious and satisfactory Answer unto. How knoweth he, but some, yea, many may have that to say to him, *Si Error est quod credo, a te deceptus sum*, If I be in an Error, you have led me into it, or have helpt to confirm me in it.

I thought I had demonstrated to the Doctor, that he was *besides his Text*. That the Word, the Scripture-Rule is that *same Rule* the Apostle would have Christians walk by ( *Phil* 3. 16. ) And that the *Established Rule*, the Doctor would have it applyed to, is such a Rule, as he himself hath told the World, the Apostles and *Primo-Primitive* Christians had not. And if they had no such Rule, nor would ever have established such a Rule, then it certainly follows, the Apostle should not be supposed there to press Christians to *walk by such a Rule*, ( which was no Rule with him ) [ viz. *Rector of Sutton*, p. 10, 11, 17, f. 18. ] Yet I observe, where he pretends to clear the Text from all Objections, ( *pag.* 163 to 176. ) he says not one word to this *Material Objection*. And so he waves what Mr. Baxter says; ( Answer *pag.* 29. ) What he replieth to others, I suppose they will consider. Here ( I conceive ) he cannot well say, as *pag.* 333. "*I decline nothing that looks like Argument.*" And *pag.* 393. "*I have not concealed the Force and Strength I saw in any of them.*"

There I thought it sufficient to argue from the Doctor's former *Concessions*, or rather his plain *Affertions*, taking the Matter to be so clear and evident, that no sober Man, and much less he, would deny. But if he had put me to *prove*, that the Apostles did not, neither would ever establish such a Rule, nor could have established it, ( as Apostles as commissioned by Christ, as infallible Guides and Governours of the Church ) I should have counted it an *easy Task*, especially when he hath done it so well to my hand, from *Act.* 15. 28, &c. This one hint may suffice at present, the Apostle Peter was to be blamed, for that by his Example, only he would have drawn the Gentile-Believers at *Antioch* to Conformity to the Jewish Ceremonies, *Gal.* 2. 11, 14. *Why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?* The Apostle Paul, who thus reproveth him, yet says himself, *1 Cor.* 9. 20. *Unto the Jews, I became as a Jew.* — And those Ceremonies he conformed to among the Jewes, ( as at *Jerusalem* ) were in themselves *as lawful* and *innocent*, as the Ceremonies imposed among us. But he would not have the Gentiles *compell'd* to more than was necessary. He that was so moved,  
and

and offended, to see but an *Example* leading that way, how much more would he have withstood any (one, or more) that were for establishing such a Rule? Yet the Doctor tells us, he is certain, he did not mistake the sense of his Text, Preface pag. 63.

But let such things pass, as the Doctor hath pleased to do. And if he had let all pass that hath been said, that the Controversies he hath raised, might have been laid asleep, or had used other Methods and Measures than he hath taken, I should have been better satisfied, than I can be with his present Answer. I am sorry we did not all put him in mind of that, *Præstat motos componere fluctus*. However (Sir) I must acknowledg your Kindness, in sending me this [*Impartial Account*, &c.] (as it is called) and that you have since furnished me with his [*Rational Account*] also, wherein you have greatly pleased me. Many Years since I looked into it, and doubted not, (when I was writing those former Papers) but I could have made some use of it; but I could not then meet with the Book, for want of which I looked on those Collections as incomplete.

Truly (Sir) I was in hopes the learned Doctor had retained that same Spirit of Moderation towards his dissenting Brethren, which those sober moderate Principles he hath published, and commended unto others heretofore, spake him to have. How strange is it, that the Reverend Doctor, should ever forget the *Rector of Sutton*? And is it not as strange, that he should be for silencing such a one (as of Scismatical Principles?) Or to speak more plainly, should be ashamed to own him in that worthy Work, so full of Learning and Judgment, meriting Praise, rather than Censure: But it is too plain here, he hath deserted the *Rector of Sutton*, and that in a Matter wherein he was in the right, and had the strongest Reason on his side, and hath given up the Cause to such an imposing Party, as before he had condemned. And what is the matter, that the Reverend Doctor is so highly offended at me, for desiring he would renew his old Acquaintance with one so near him, and be friends again? None in the World being nearer to him, if that be true, *Proximus sum egomet mihi*; unless he will say, and make that good (in none of the best sense) *Ego non sum ego*. Now I am heartily sorry, if we may see Reason to change our Opinion of him, as he says we may, of some Persons, as well as Things, in twenty Years time, (Preface pag. 76.)

Sure I am, it either does, or ought to grieve me at heart, to see his Hand at such dividing Work, who of all the dignified Persons in England, I had thought, was specially engaged, and hoped also, was as well inclined, to promote Union what in him lay; but not to widen Differences, by pressing and pleading so hard for Dividing-Terms. When certain Bishops were met, that sought nothing more, than that poor *Athanasius*



might be oppressed, *Doli, Calumniis, & malis Artibus*; Paphnutius seeing it, rose up, and took Maximus (who, as I remember, had been a Confessor) by the hand, saying, *Neque te deest una inter istos sedere*. So I thought it least became the Reverend Doctor to appear with the forwardest in condemning his dissenting Brethren, whose Cause he had so well pleaded in time past. He begins his Preface with a Story of the learned and excellent Bishop Jewell, (which I leave to others to examine) But here I call to mind the Story of Bishop Lindsey, a Scottish-Bishop, who before he came to his Dignity, had given this Question at St. Andrew's, *Whether things indifferent once abused, and for their Abuse abolished?* &c. *Negatur*. Where he could bid Defiance to those that were for retaining such Ceremonies. Yet afterwards he was a zealous Contender for them, turning *Disce pati*, into *Dissipate*. And the great complaint of him was, that in dealing with his Brethren, he remembered not what he was once himself, that he pitied not his former Case (as some of them said) in their Persons, as Augustine did the Manichees, greater Hereticks than he took them to be, *Let them be fierce* (rigorous) *against you, who never were deceived with the like Error, as they see you*. But as for me, *I can use no such Rigor against you, with whom I ought to bear now, as I did at that time with my self*, &c. Thus I could wish the Doctor would be as favourable as it becometh him to be, in his Censures of his Brethren, who are very much of the same mind, he was of once.

And therefore I shall once again apply my self to him.

Reverend Sir;

I do not very well know, whether that Title [*The Rector of Sutton committed with the Dean of St. Paul's*] makes you more angry, or merry. This I know, those Papers of mine went out of my hands, without any Title: who put that to it I know not.

The Title, you say, (Preface p. 71.) "*Was enough to make the common People imagine this was some busie Justice of Peace, who had taken them both at a Conventicle*. And I confess the word [*Committed*] might puzzle those that could not English *bonos inter sese committere* (there p. 7.) But sure you had no thought of my being a *Justice of Peace*, any more than I should suspect the *Dean of St. Paul's* (since I have heard of, and seen what he hath both preached, and written against them) would frequent Conventicles. However you rub up my Memory here, that I have one thing to put you in mind of, though perhaps you'll call me a *busie Informer* for it, in your Next. And yet call me at your pleasure, so that it may incline you to more favourable Thoughts of *truly Religious Assemblies*, such as you have condemned, as *Conventicles*, and *separate Meetings*. In the former times of *England's* Distractions and Confusions, I being unsatisfied of



of the Lawfulness of keeping ( in publick ) either those days of Thanksgiving for Victories, or of Fasting and Prayer for a Blessing on those Counsels, and Forces that then were, ( as appointed ) it happened that Mr. S. preached in my place upon one of these Fast-days ( I suppose at the Request of some, but unknown to me ) The Text in *Dent.* *For this is your Wisdom, &c.* which some remember still, though it is about twenty Years since, when I ( at the same time ) had a private Meeting at St. *Lawrence's*, as one called it. This I confess may look something like a personal Reflection; but my end here is, that you would be pleased to resolve me these Queries, *viz.*

Whether ever you accounted this Act Schismatical, preaching without the Consent of the *Rector* of the Parish? Or the Assembly that joyned, at that time, Schismatics? Yet was here no breach of Order. Or were there no Churches in *England* then, or till your establish'd Rule came in? And yet, Sir, I had never the less Esteem of Mr. S. at that time, or of others, who were satisfied to go farther than I durst.

Again, Whether was our private Meeting at that time a sinful Conventicle, when the far greater part of the Parish was with him at Church? I hope you will grant it was a lawful, because a Loyal Conventicle.

But so much to your Reflection on the *Title* of my former Papers. Now Sir, consider whether we have not more just Exceptions against this of yours.

(1.) The *unreasonableness of Separation.*] Here 1. Consider whether you do not condemn that as *Separation*, which is not. And is that reasonable? All Assemblies, distinct from yours, are not separate Meetings, as the Word is used in an evil sense; no, though they differ in some unnecessary Mode, or Circumstances of Worship, many that ordinarily joyn with you in the substantial parts of Worship, and meet not in Opposition; yet I cannot discern, but their Meetings fall under your Censure, as much as others, because they keep not to your establish'd Rule, when ( *Preface pag. 40.* ) you speak of an *unaccountable Separation, without regard to the greatness or smallness of Parishes, &c.* doth not that imply, that there may be some Account given for assembling to worship God, where there is a regard to this, to the Abilities and Piety of Ministers, and to the Peace and Order of the Church? And therefore the thing is not so *unreasonable* as you would make it. (2.) What if I prove ( in examining your Three Conclusions ) from the Principles you lay down in your *Irenicum*, and *Rational Account* too, that many are necessitated to separate from your Communion; Is Separation unreasonable, when necessary? Or will you allow others to say, that there you have pleaded for *unreasonable Separation*?

(2.) An

(2.) An *Impartial Account*, &c. you call it. Here I might say, I was glad to see you promising *Impartiality* in this Work, having found so little of it in your Sermon: but upon search *Quantà de spe decidi?* The Partiality you have discovered is so great, and in so many Particulars, that if I should *ransack every Corner of your Book* (as you speak) to collect all such Passages, I fear I should be very tedious and irksome to you and other Readers. But

1. May not some of the common People, who have read either what Mr. Baxter says of it, or Mr. Newcomen (in *Serm. on Nov. 5. 1642.*) take you to be partial in setting down the Jesuit *Contzens Directions* for reducing Popery (Preface pag. 19. 20.) In that you take no notice of putting out of Honours, Dignities, and publick Offices such as are most adverse to Popery, or of the ousting of Ministers, as unpeaceable, proud, obstinate, disobedient to Magistrates: And forbidding them privately, or publickly to assemble? And take no notice of that, *How easie is it* (as he says) in England to bring the Puritans into Order, if they be forced to approve of Bishops? &c. Here I think of your Words, pag. 10. "I do not say, such Men are set on by Jesuits, but I say, they do their work as effectually. — So it would be considered, whether such Methods do not effectually promote the Jesuits design of reducing Popery. You may give us to understand (Preface pag. 22.) that the Declaration of Indulgence 167 $\frac{1}{2}$  was of the Papists procuring; but we must not say, that the turning out of many zealous Protestant Justices, and Ministers, was any way by their means.

2. Are you impartial in the Account you give of the Reformation in King Edward 6 and Q. Elizabeth's Raigh? Did the Reformation lie in those things wherein Dissenters differ from you? Then you must say, that those Churches which aimed at an exact Conformity with the Apostolick Times, and (as Chillingworth says) took their Direction only from Scripture, were yet so far unreformed, as they wanted our Ceremonies. Though it soundeth very harshly, to say that those Churches who were more conformed to the Scripture Rule, were less reformed. But you spake more impartially, and more to the honour of our First Reformers, *Irenic. pag. 124.* which you was minded of, (*Rector of Sutton p. 6.*) Certainly those holy Men, who did seek by any means to draw in others, &c. And by that Rubrick, which left it at the discretion of the Minister, what, and how much to read, when there was a Sermon, it is evident, others since have sought to bear up their Authority by their Names, who have been far from their Moderation.

I cannot but wonder at your Harangue (Book pag. 6.) "Is it credible, that Men of so great Integrity, such indefatigable Industry, such profound Judgment, as Cranmer and Ridley, who were the Heads of the Reformation, should



should discern no Sinfulness in these things. — Could not Latimer, or Bradford, or such holy, mortified Men as they, discern so much as a Mote of Unlawfulness? &c.

It is granted, they were Learned, Pious, Excellent Men; yet it need not seem strange, much less incredible, that such worthy Men should in some things mistake. Does not *A. B. Laud* tell you, *Reformation is so difficult a Work, and subject to so many Pretensions, that 'tis almost impossible but the Reformers should step too far, or fall too short in some smaller things or other?* I suppose you may have Bishop Cranmer's Manuscript still by you; and are you of his Judgment in all things? I do not find it so, comparing what you published, as his Judgment in your *Irenicum*, and what you have published in this Book, as your own. And *Latimer*, that Zealous and Faithful Martyr, (as I remember) at the end of his Sermons, used to excite the Hearers to Prayer, and therein to remember such as were departed this Life. Now, must we therefore conclude, there is not a Mote of Unlawfulness in praying for the Dead, that otherwise such an holy Man as *Latimer*, would not have been for it? Most true it is, considering the Times they lived in, and the Temper of the Persons they had to deal with, it was the great Work of God to carry on Reformation so far by them. But I cannot say, but their Hearts were to have carried it on further, if the Times would have born it. (More Shame it is to others, that have had fairer Opportunities since, and yet have not minded the Work.) *History of the Troubles at Franksford* (printed 1575, reprinted 1642. p. 42.) telleth of one that said, Bishop Cranmer had drawn up a Book of Prayer, an hundred times more perfect, but the Clergy and Convocation with other Enemies would not let it pass. And there followeth something further worth your noting. (pag. 43.) that *Bullinger* told *Whittingham*, Mr. H. and Mr. C. asked his Judgment concerning certain Points of that (our) Book, as *Sarplice*, *private Baptism*, *Churching Women*, the *Ring in Marriage*, with such like, which (as he said) he allowed not, and that he neither could if he would, neither would if he might use the same in his Church, whatsoever had been reported. Therefore (say I) such a Man as *Bullinger* would not have been for imposing the same on others.

As to the Retormation in Queen *Elizabeth's* time, it was not brought in, nor brought on with a rigorous Imposition of those things in Controversie; as *Ball* against *Can*, Part 2. p. 13. In the first ten Years of *Q. Elizabeth*, there was sweet consent among Brethren. — I think there was not a Man that thought of Separation. The pressing of *Subscription and Conformity* in the tenth year of *Q. Elizabeth's* Reign, was that which brought in all the Troubles and Contentions following. *Josias Nichol's* (*Plea of the Innocent*, p. 216, 217, printed 1602.) thus: Some five Years together

together, before that unhappy time that Subscription was so generally offered, ( which is now some 18 Years past ) there was such Unity between the Ministers, and they joyned in all places so lovingly, and diligently in Labour; that not only did the unpreaching Minister and Non-resident quake, and prepare themselves in measure to take pains in the Church; but also many thousands were converted from *Atheism* and *Pope-ry*, &c. But when Subscription came abroad, how did it shake the Heavens, and darken the Skies? ( O Lord my Heart trembleth to think upon it ) how many godly, and worthy learned Preachers were silenced, deprived, and greatly disgraced! How were the holy Ministers divided and distracted! How were the Christian Subjects grieved and offended, and the Papists and wicked Men encouraged and emboldened! What a damp brought it to all Godliness and Religion? and since that time what horrible Wickedness, Whoredom, Drunkenness, and all shameless Filthiness, and what grievous Plagues of God, one succeeding another, have followed, every good Christian Subject must needs see and lament? So he who was no *Separatist*. And I hope Sir, you and I are agreed, that these things last spoken of, were no part of England's Reformation. And now Sir, give me leave to tell you ( in some of your own Words, *Preface* p. 47. ) *We were in a lamentable case as to the Defence of the Reformation, if we had no more to plead for it,* ( than we have indeed to plead for such mischievous Impositions. ) And this seems to have been the sense of the *Queen's Council* in that Letter, which the *modest Enquiry* ( p. 16, 17. ) lays before you.

Therefore Sir, I beseech you, as you would not *blast the Credit, and Honour of the Reformation*, place it not in such things, as rather brought a *Deformation* on us.

Here I know not well how to reconcile you to your self. For, p. 365. You say, "It was the great Wisdom of our Church not to make more things necessary ( as to Practice ) than were made so at the Settlement of our Reformation; but whether there be sufficient Reason to alter those Terms of Communion which were then settled, for the sake of such whose Scruples are groundless and endless, I do not take upon me here to determine. And *Preface* p. 53. "Although the Arguments are very plausible one way, yet the Objections are very strong another. The Union of Protestants, the Ease of scrupulous Consciences, the providing for so many poor Families of ejected Ministers ( but not a word of providing for so many poor Congregations, and dark corners of the Land, that have need of them ) "Are great Motives on one side. But the weighty Considerations on the other side, pag. 54. And double in number too, as you reckon. So here I see your Mind, as you hold the Scales, you might, and would determine that there is no sufficient Reason to alter those Terms of Communion, which



*which (in the great Wisdom of our Church) were settled, for the sake of such, whose Scruples are groundless and endless. For certainly those Arguments that are only plausible with you, would not weigh down such as are strong and cogent, nor a few Motives weigh down more weighty Considerations. But then, what did you think of, when you put that Question, Preface, p. 81. 'Is there nothing to be done for Dissenting Protestants? — Do we value a few indifferent Ceremonies, and some late Declarations, and doubtful Expressions, beyond the satisfaction of Mens Consciences, and the Peace and Stability of this Church? And how happy had England been, if such things had not been so over-valued! As to this material Question, you deliver your Opinion (you say) freely and impartially. How Sir! what? Are you for altering what was settled in so great Wisdom, by Men of so great Integrity, such indefatigable Industry, such profound Judgment? Is this for the Honour of our Reformation? Is not this to blast the Credit of the Reformation?*

I shall not take upon me, to animadvert upon the whole of your Answer to this *material Question*, presuming it will be scann'd by some of better Judgment. Only one or two things I cannot but take notice of. So I heartily thank you for that, P. 82. (3.) 'Notwithstanding, because the use of Sacraments in a Christian Church ought to be the most free from all Exceptions, and they ought to be so administred, as rather to invite than discourage scrupulous Persons from joyning in them; I do think, it would be a part of Christian Wisdom and Condescension (*only here I would say, Duty*) in the Governours of our Church, to remove those Bars from a Freedom in joyning in a full Communion. Now thanks for thus much: and hold to it, Sir. Tho I have two great and learned Men of the Church of England (worthy of Note with you) just at hand, that grant as much of other parts of God's Worship, as you do of Sacraments; *scil.* that they should be free from all Exceptions. See *Hales of Schism*, (in *Miscel.* p. 216, 217, 218.) And you were once of his Mind, *Irenic.* p. 120. And *Chillingworth*, p. 180. *If all Men would believe the Scripture, and freeing themselves from Prejudice and Passion, would sincerely endeavour to find the true Sence of it, and live according to it, and require no more of others, but to do so; nor denying their Communion to any that do so, would so order their publick Service of God, that all which do so, may without Scruple, or Hypocrisy, or protestation against any part of it, joyn with them in it: who does not see that, &c.*

Again, I cast my Eye on that, p. 87. where you would have indulged Persons to pay Twelve pence a Sunday for their absence from the Parochial Churches, which (you say) *cannot be complained of as any heavy Burthen.* Which such will not thank you for. You would have them indulged, and not indulged. And is Twelve Pence a Week no burden to those, that

with hard Labour have much ado to maintain their Families, can scarce clear Twelve Pence per Week? See what it is to be rich in this World, that makes some insensible of the low Estate others live in. And would you have Servants thus *polled* too? tho their Wages may not amount to so much.

But now at last I come to that, which I said, makes you hardly reconcilable to your self. Preface, p. 92. 'Such a Review made by wise and peaceable Men, not given to Wrath, and Disputing; may be so far from being a Dishonour to this Church, that it may add to the Glory of it. And the like you must say, of removing those Bars to Communion in Sacraments, because it would be a part of Christian Wisdom. Now lay things together, Dr. Stilling. says, Preface, p. 53, 54. *There are strong Objections, and weighty Considerations against the Alteration of the established Laws.* And p. 364. would not take upon him to determine, *Whether there be sufficient Reason to alter those terms of Communion settled.* And yet Dr. Stilling. says, Preface, p. 82, 92. That an *Alteration would be a part of Christian Wisdom; and so far from being a dishonour to this Church, that it would add to the Glory of it.* And hereupon I put this Query, Whether Men are justly charged, as *blasting the Honour of the Reformation*, for dissenting in such things, which it would be the Churches Glory to alter?

3. Are you *Impartial* in the Account you give of the *old-Non-Conformists*, as if it was their general Sence, that Ministers were to *forbear all Preaching*, when silenced? In the Contents of your Book, Part. I § 17. it is thus, [*The old Non-conformists Judgment of the unlawfulness of Mens preaching here, when forbidden by Laws, fully cleared from some late Objections.*] Which you undertake, p. 78. &c. That their Judgment and Practice was to *forbear preaching in their Parish Churches*, while they were under Suspension, I grant. And did not the present Non-conformists follow them herein? Did they not generally quit the *Temples*, as well as their *Tithes, and Profits*, from Aug. 24. 62. yielding these to be at the Magistrates dispose? They would not that you, or others, should call their Preaching (as you do) *preaching in opposition* to established Laws, whereunto they yielded, as far as they could be satisfied it was lawful for them. But do you your self believe, that the *old Non-conformists* thought it unlawful for them to preach at all, when silenced? Then you cannot take them to have been very honest, upright Men, who did so ordinarily recede from their own Principles. Were not some of them glad of an opportunity of Preaching in another Diocese, when they might not be suffered to preach where they lived? And were not many of them for the exercise of their Ministry in private, when they were denied liberty in publick. Fr. Johnson speaks of their suffering themselves to be deposed from their (stated) *publick Ministry*, which



which you seem to overlook. And so I think *Beza* may well be understood of quitting their former *publick Employments* (with whose Testimony you make so great a Flourish, p. 21, 22.) 'What! is *Beza* for silencing, and stopping the Mouths of such a number of faithful and able Ministers? — 'Would *Beza*, even *Beza*, at such a time as that, be for silencing so many 'Preachers? — It appears that *Beza* was not of the Mind of our Adversaries — That he expresseth no such terrible apprehensions at their quitting their Places, as he doth at their Preaching in opposition to the Laws. To which I return, Were not the Non-conformists generally, both at that time, and since, for *quitting their Places*, rather than holding on in publick, to the defiance of the Laws? They have desired, as far as they could, to avoid the exasperating of Rulers. They were not for *opposing Sword to Sword*, as *Bradshaw* has it; they were not movers of Sedition, nor have been to this day. And would Mr. *Baxter*, even Mr. *Baxter*, be for their silencing; yet he says, (in his *Search for the English Schismatick*, p. 37.) 'It 'is not their Judgment (speaking of the meer Non-conformists) that they 'are bound to Preach, when by opposing violence, or the offending of Rulers, it is likely to do more hurt than good, and once preaching to deprive 'them of all the usefulness of their Lives, &c.

But I doubt not, there are many Christians yet alive, who can remember some of the old Non-conformists, and their *preaching in private Houses*, when suspended from Preaching in Churches. One writes me word, that Mr. *Hildersam* used to preach in his own House, when silenced; and two or three Families came to hear him. Another special Friend, helping me to a sight of some Papers of Mr. *E. Reyner* (formerly) of *Lincoln*, I meet with this considerable Passage: 'For me to preach in this Place, and at 'this Time, is no way necessary, since others may do it, and I my self ' (tho put by here) may do it as well and freely elsewhere, as in *New-England, Ireland, Scotland, Holland*; yea, haply in some remote out-wing of 'the Kingdom. And thus God (in his ordinary Providence) doth order it, 'that his Church gains much by this course of removing Ministers, and 'transplanting the Gospel to such Places, as never heard the sound thereof 'before; and in the mean while they may have time to do much good in 'private, &c. And I think this was the general Sence of the Non-conformists, that they did not look on the censure of Suspension, (if unjust) as a sufficient discharge from the exercise of their Ministry. Had they thought themselves bound to cease Preaching, whensoever they were prohibited by Men, they were honest Men, than to act so contrary to their Judgment; as they used frequently to preach, (tho more privately, or in Places where they were not known) when suspended by the Bishops. But these things were not to be publickly talkt of then, when the *High Commission-Court*

was up, and there was such Inquisition after their Meetings.

I have this Account of Mr. *Simeon Ash*, from one ( whose Father's House was as his home sometimes ) that when he was sought after by Pursevents, coming to them, they had Meetings in the Night-time. Another, ( a Minister ) tells me he hath heard from Ancient Christians in *Ringly* Congregation, that Mr. *John Angier*, sometimes Minister there, being silenced, and having his Chappel suspended by the *Bishop of Chester*, used to preach to divers in his own House, till such times as he was removed to *Denton*. I suppose, there are some in those Parts ( yet alive ) that can testify so much; Mr. *Westowbye* I well knew. His Bible was his Licence. The Courts could not take him off, but he would be at his Work, in one place or other. Once after my preaching for him, ( when he was scarce able to get into the Pulpit for Age, and Weakness accompanying it ) he entertained me with a Discourse of much of his Life past, the Troubles and Opposition he had met with in the World, and the great Experience he had of the most *encouraging Success* of his Ministry under his greatest Troubles, that in his Travels he could write to his Wife, ( as he said ) that *God had given him many Children* she knew not of.

But to enquire after the Practice of particular Persons would be a tedious and endless Work. You have the *Judgment of the Assembly*, under that Head of *Ordination*, where they would have the Person to be ordained, declare his *sincere Intentions* and Ends in entring into this Calling : And his *Resolution* to continue *against all Trouble and Persecution*. If that Assembly were *Non-conformists*, then you see there the *Judgment of the Non-conformists*. But if they were generally *Conformists*, then you see, we have the Judgment of a Learned Synod of *Conformists* for us.

4. Are you not too *partial* in *allowing Protestants to be occasionally present at some parts of Worship in the Roman Church, and that frequently too, to hear Sermons, &c.* ( how far your *et cetera* may reach, others cannot tell, till you better inform them ) while you do not allow them to be present at the Worship performed in the Assemblies of Dissenters ? The former you are for, *pag. 108*. To your Question there, *doth this make a Man to have Communion with the Church of Rome ?* I answer, yea, so far as he joyns in their Worship, so far he has Communion with them. Sure you will not deny a Man to have any Communion with you in hearing the Word preached, who comes for that End, and that frequently too. So here you must be supposed to grant *Occasional Communion with the Roman Church* in hearing of Sermons, &c, and *that frequently too, to be lawful*. Now this is more than you allow to Dissenters, *pag. 98*. " No Man denies, that more places for Worship are desirable, and would be very useful, where they may be had, and the same way of Worship, and Order observed in them, as in  
" our



“ our Parochial Churches; where they may be under the same Inspection,  
 “ and Ecclesiastical Government.— But, is it possible that Mr. B.  
 “ should think the Case alike, where the Orders of our Church are con-  
 “ stantly neglected, the Authority of the Bishops is slighted and contem-  
 “ ned; and such Meetings are kept up in Affront to them, and the Laws?  
 Here you say in Effect, that let Parishes be never so large, and the Ne-  
 cessities of Souls never so urgent, the Assemblies of Dissenters are not  
 desirable, nor to be encouraged, because not under your establish'd Rule.  
 But either you must grant, it may be lawful to *joyn occasionally, and that*  
*frequently too, with the Non-conformists*, or you must judg them worse than  
*Papish Teachers*, and say that it was better for Men to hear these, than such  
 as Mr. B. &c. I know not whether you might fear the least counte-  
 nancing of *occasional Communion with Non-conformists*, lest any should  
 thence argue from your own Words, that *constant Communion with them is*  
*a Duty*. I am thinking however, that the Papists may thank you for so  
 much Kindness to them, that you grant it lawful for Protestants to be  
*occasionally present* in some parts of their Worship. And let them alone to  
 make their best of what you say, *you are sure will follow*, p. 176. and p. 77.  
 “ As far as Men judg Communion lawful, it becomes a Duty, and Sepa-  
 “ ration a Sin; under what Denomination soever the Persons pass.—  
 “ Because then Separation appears most unreasonable, when occasional  
 “ Communion is confessed to be lawful. If they can get Protestants to  
 joyn with them ordinarily, though but *in some parts of their Worship at first*,  
 its possible, they would gain far more Profelites by it, than *Non-conformists*  
 have drawn or would draw into Separation.

You seem to suppose great Force and Virtue in that *Salvo*, p. 156. “ A  
 “ Man is not said to separate from every Church, where he forbears or  
 “ ceases to have Communion; but only from that Church, with which  
 “ he is obliged to hold Communion. As if a Christian was only obliged  
 to Communion with some one particular Church. Yet you will look up-  
 on your self, not only as a *Member of the Church of England*, but as a  
*Member of the Catholick Church*. And as you are a Member of the Catho-  
 lick Church, it may possibly sometimes fall out, that you may be *obliged*  
 to have *Communion occasionally* with a *Dutch Church*, or a *French Church*.  
 And if *Non-conformists*, with their Assemblies may be proved as sound  
 parts of the Church Catholick, as others you can freely have Communion  
 with, and while they differ from you in nothing, but if the same was re-  
 moved, your Churches might be every jot as sound and pure, I can see  
*no sufficient Reason* why you might not as *lawfully* have Occasional Com-  
 munion with them; and then for ought I know, you may be obliged  
 thereunto, it may be *a Duty*. Because you wholly overlook this, I thought

fit to take notice of it. And further I would put you in mind of your own Arguments, pag. 157. viz.

1. "The general Obligation upon Christians to use all lawful Means for preserving the Peace and Unity of the Church. And here I ask, If there be not *as great an Obligation* at least, upon Christians to *preserve Peace*, or promote it *with all Christians, as with all Men*: And they are bound to that, *as far as possible, and as much as lies in them*, Rom. 12. 18. And if you supposed the present Dissenters to be as bad as the Donatists, (which you cannot in reason suppose) yet your Learned and Excellent Hales says, (Miscel. of Schism, p. 208.) *Why might it not be lawful to go to Church with the Donatists? — if occasion so require*, And Ibid. p. 209. *In all publick Meetings pretending Holiness, so there be nothing done but what true Devotion and Piety brook, why may not I be present in them, and use Communication with them?*

2 "The particular force of that Text, Phil. 3. 16. *As far as you have already attained, walk by the same Rule, &c.* And one would think, such as have attained so much Knowledg, as to see it *lawful to joyn with the Roman Church in some parts of Worship*, might know, it cannot but be as lawful at least to joyn in Worship with *Non-conformists*.

5. Are you not *partial*, when you lay this down, (p. 157.) "As one of the provoking Sins of the *Non-conformists*, that they have been so backward in doing what they were convinced they might have done, with a good Conscience, when they were earnestly pressed to it by those in Authority, &c. (yet you tell us not what things those are, neither the time when they were pressed thereunto, and refused the same. And I never heard of any Motions or Overtures for Peace, that were reasonable, made to them, which they refused.) But you never take notice of it, as any *provoking Sin*, in those that would not hearken to their most just and earnest *Petition for Peace*. Might not they with a good Conscience have forborn those *needless Impositions*, which they very well knew would be so grievous and burdensome to many? And might not so much have been expected from them, as they would profess themselves to be for *Unity and Peace*? May I not here return your own Words, pag. 159. "Was ever Schism made so light a matter of, and the Peace and Unity of Christians valued at so low a Rate; that for the Prevention of the one, and the Preservation of the other, a thing that is lawful may not be done? (Or as I would say, that the imposing of things *indifferent*, and *not necessary*, in their own Judgment, but things *doubtful*, or *unlawful* in the Judgment of others, might not be forborn?)

Now, (Sir) are you for *palliating so great Sin*, as the causing of Schism and Dissention in the Church, when you know, "The Obligation which  
"lieth



“ lieth upon all Christians; to preserve the Peace and Unity of the Church,  
 “ ( which you give us again, p. 209. ) And I find you citing these words of  
*A. B. Land* in your *Rational Account*, p. 324, “ Nor is he a Christian that  
 “ would not have Unity, might he have it with Truth. But I never said,  
 “ nor thought, that the Protestants made this Rent (Dissenting Prote-  
 stants, say we ) “ The cause of the Schism is yours; for you thrust us from  
 “ you, because we called for Truth, and redress of Abuses. And there at  
 the End of pag. 102. You could not but judge it a very prudent Expression  
 of his Lordship, *That the Church of England is not such a Shrew to her Chil-*  
*dren, as to deny her Blessing, or denounce an Anathema against them, if some*  
*peaceably dissent in some Particulars remoter from the Foundation, &c.* Where  
 I observe you cannot well plead the Cause of our Separation from Rome,  
 without pleading something for Dissenters. But to return to your *Im-*  
*partial Account*, p. 209. You say, “ Violation of the Unity of the Church,  
 “ where there is no sufficient Reason to justify it, is a Sin, as much as  
 “ Murder is, and as plainly forbidden (and in some respects aggravated be-  
 “ yond it, *Preface* p. 45.) All which returns upon your selves, if the Arch-  
 Bishop’s Words may take place. And consider further seriously, whether  
 there be any sufficient Reason to justify the pressing and imposing of those  
 things, which might lawfully be forborn, when the imposing of them  
 will certainly cause a Violation of the Churches Unity and Peace. Yet  
 this is a thing, you take no notice of, unless it be to justify it. As p. 76.  
 “ The Church of England hath as much occasion to account those Scruples  
 “ unreasonable, as they do those of the *Independents*, *Anabaptists*, and  
 “ *Quakers*. And pag. 59. So it is impossible for them to answer the *Ana-*  
 “ *baptists*, who have as just a Plea for Separation from them, as they can  
 “ have from the Church of England. Now lay these together, and what  
 follows, but that as much is to be pleaded for the *English Ceremonies*, and  
 other things imposed, which the *Non-conformists* stick at, as can be pleaded  
 for the baptizing of Infants, or against *Re-baptization* ( and I may add,  
 or against the way of the *Quakers*. ) In the *Fifty Queries* concerning In-  
 fants Right to Baptism, I set that down last, which I desired they would  
 specially observe, *Scil.* “ Whether the Anabaptist’s Schism be not worse  
 “ than their simple Opinion? And whether it be not desirable, and  
 “ possible, that some Way be found out, and Terms laid down in which  
 “ good and sober Men on both sides might agree, and hold Communion,  
 ( as Christians? ) concerning which, something is proposed there ( from  
 Mr. B. ) to others Consideration. This the Author of the *Anti-Queries*  
 took little notice of, which engaged me to mind him of it again, in my  
*Reply*, p. 25, 26. And yet I have met with no other Answer from him,  
 but that he is loth at present to give an Answer to it, intreating all his  
 Friends

Friends to take it into Consideration, because it is a *matter of Moment*, and *common Concern*. (*T. G's Controversy, &c. epitomised, p. 64.*) From whence I conclude, if such Terms of Moderation were offered, they would be hard put to it, scarce know what to say for a standing off, and denying to have Communion with Christians of a different Perswasion; but they would have enough to say against your Terms: and that from your self, and not only in your *Irenicum*, but in your *Rational Account, p. 209.* 'It is a very necessary Enquiry, what the cause of (the distance) is, and where the main Fault lies; and it being acknowledged that there is a possibility, that Corruptions may get into a Christian Church, and it being impossible to prove, that Christianity obligeth Men to communicate with a Church, in all those (they will say, in any) Corruptions, its Communion may be tainted with; it seems evident to Reason, that the cause of the Breach must lie there, where the Corruptions are owned, and imposed, as Conditions of Communion, &c.

I should have hoped, that at least you would have granted the conditions put upon Ministers to be very hard; yet I find nothing; but a *deep silence* here. Tho Mr. *Cheny* says, 'I am satisfied that it is in it self a great and dreadful Sin to silence the Non-conformists. It seems here is a *provoking Sin*, which you was willing to overlook, tho once in your Sermon, *p. 20.* you were very near it.

6. Do you speak *Impartially, p. 378, 379.* when you tell us, you wonder, that *none of us have taken any care to put any stop to Separation, or to let you know, where you may fix and see an end of it; what Scruples are to be allowed, and what not?* I will say nothing for those, who are better able to speak for themselves: but for my self, I thought I had told you plainly, and sufficiently out of your *Irenicum* (if you will not be offended that I call it *yours*) where I would have you fix. *Let Christians stand upon the same terms now, as they did in the time of Christ and his Apostles. Do not add other conditions of Church-Communion than Christ hath done.* (*As Rector of Sutton, p. 6, 7. See also p. 59.*) If you make no new Terms, and yet others will separate from you still, the Sin is *theirs*: but if indeed you add other Terms, then beware, that you be not found the *Schismaticks*.

Do not turn me off here, as you do Mr. *Baxter's Way of Concord*. You cannot justly say, we go on in *impracticable Notions* here, or dividing Principles. (When you have that Word, *Preface p. 38. As tho he had been Christ's Plenipotentiary upon Earth*, You forgot that others might as well apply it to the Rector of Sutton, for publishing his *Irenicum*.)

And I hope you will not deny, but we are backt with great Authority, when you consider, what King *James* tells Cardinal *Du Perron*, by the Pen of *Isaac Causabon*, (which Mr. *Baxter* takes notice of, *Direct. p. 752.*) His  
Maje-



*Majesty thinketh, that for Concord there is no nearer way, than diligently to separate things necessary from the unnecessary, and to bestow all our labour that we may agree in the things necessary, and that in things unnecessary, there may be place given for Christian Liberty. A Golden Sentence ! And there is nothing that can be proved necessary, but it must be either expressly taught, or commanded in the Word of God, or deduced thence by necessary Consequence. And that of the Lord Bacon (Essay 3.) is considerable, who for the true placing the Bonds of Unity, would have Points fundamental, and of Substance in Religion, truly discerned and distinguished from Points not meerly of Faith, but of Opinion, Order, or good Intention. And Chillingworth is full of such impracticable Notions, (if they deserve to be so called,) p. 197. — He that could assert Christians to that Liberty, which Christ and his Apostles left them, must needs do Truth a most Heroical Service. And seeing the over-valuing of the Differences among Christians, is one of the greatest Maintainers of the Schisme of Christendom, &c. p. 198. Certainly if Protestants be faulty in this matter (of playing the Pope) it is for doing it too much, and not too little. — Take away these Walls of Separation, and all will quickly be one. Take away this Persecuting, Burning, Cursing, Damning of Men, for not subscribing to the Words of Men, as the Words of God : Require of Christians only to believe Christ, and to call no Man Master but him only ; Let those leave claiming Infallibility, that have no Title to it ; and let them that in their Words disclaim it, disclaim it likewise in their Actions. In a Word, take away Tyranny, which is the Devils Instrument to support Errors, and Superstitions, and Impieties. — I say, take away Tyranny, and restore Christians to their just and full Liberty of captivating their Understanding to Scripture only ; and as Rivers when they have a free Passage, run all to the Ocean : so it may well be hoped, by God's Blessing, that universal Liberty thus moderated, may quickly reduce Christendom to Truth and Unity. This Citation being so long, I shall add but one more out of him, and that a shorter, p. 209. This is most certain, and I believe you will easily grant it, that to reduce Christians to Unity of Communion, there are but two ways that may be conceived probable. The one, by taking away diversity of Opinions, touching Matters of Religion : The other, by shewing that the diversity of Opinions, which is among the several Sects of Christians, ought to be no hinderance to their Unity in Communion. Last of all, I close with your Rational Account, p. 291. ' And therefore those lesser Societies cannot in Justice, make the necessary Conditions of Communion narrower, than those which belong to the Catholic Church : i. e. those things which declare Men Christians, ought to capacitate them for Communion with Christians. (Even an acknowledgment of the Scriptures as the indispensable Rule of Faith and Manners : Which (be pleased to note) is something different from your late establish'd Rule.) Now would you fix here, that those things which declare Men Christians,*

shall suffice to capacitate them for Communion with you ; how many Mens Scruples would be removed ? and what better way can you think of, to put a stop to Separation ?

7. Are you *Impartial* in charging all Nonconformist's Meetings with *Separation*, tho very many of them ordinarily join with the Parochial Congregations, and do not deny them to be true Churches, as the old Separatists did ? p. 56. ' It is true, (say you) in that Opinion they differ, but in Separation they agree. As in your Sermon, p. 33. ' For do they not do the very same things, and in the same manner, that the others do ? how comes it then to be Separation in some, and not in others ? Which I answered (*Rector of Sutton*, p. 49.) thus : What they do is not done upon the Separatists Principles, and therefore not done in the same manner. Yet you neither retract that Saying of yours, nor refute my Answer. And have not others as much reason to object against you, that when you receive the Sacrament kneeling, you do the same thing that the *Papists* and *Lutherans* do : (I do not think it manifestly appears from the Pope's manner of receiving, either sitting, or a little leaning upon his Throne, as you say, p. 15. that the *Papists* are allowed to follow him herein.) How then comes that to be an *Act of Worship* in them, when with you it is no *Act of Worship*, but a meer indifferent Ceremony ?

8. Are you not very *Partial*, in loading those that do not absolutely separate from you, but only *secundum quid*, as you do, p. 54, 55, 56. Making their Practice, that own you to be true Churches, to be the *more unjustifiable, more inexcusable, more unreasonable* Separation ? Is it not a greater Schism, to separate from you, as *no true Church*, than to do it, only because you are *faulty*, in imposing such Conditions, as they cannot lawfully submit to ? Are they the greatest Separatists, who hold Communion with you, so far as they can ? I should think, they are the greatest Separatists, whose Separation is the most *unjustifiable, inexcusable, and unreasonable*. As I had thought, there was not so much reason to deny the Being of the Church of England, while she retaineth the true Faith, and hath the true Worship of God for substance ; as there may be to doubt of the lawfulness of Ceremonies, and Modes of Worship, invented and imposed, without any clear Scripture-Warrant. And suppose one dares not receive the Communion with you, because he holdeth kneeling in that Act a participating with *Idolaters* ; and another is kept off, because he suspects there may be some *Superstition* in it ? will you say, the latter is the more unreasonable ? And do you not own those *Lutheran Churches*, that have *Exorcism* with Baptism, yet to be true Churches ? And if you was placed there, must you therefore own and use *Exorcism*, (tho against your Judgment) or be guilty of a more *inexcusable, unreasonable Separation* from them, than the *Papists*, who deny them to be true Churches ?



9. Are you *Impartial*, in allowing a different way of Worship, to the Members of *Forreign Churches* here in *England*, (as p. 147, 148.) while you are against allowing the like Liberty to Natives, which you deny not to Strangers? Bishop *Davenant* (*Ad patem Eccl. Adhort.* p. 116. Rat 3.) argues, *That none ought to deal more hardly, with their Christian Brethren of other Churches, than with their own.* (Rom. 12. 5.) *Nam fraternitas Christiana quæ intercedit inter membra Christi non variatur pro locorum aut nationum varietate.* You would have your own more hardly dealt with than those of *forreign Churches*. Now what Equity is here? Either you have Communion with those of *Forreign Churches* (notwithstanding their different way of Worship) or you have not. If you have no Communion with them, then are you not *Schismatics* from those Churches? If you have Communion with them, why may you not as lawfully have Communion with Non-conformists in their way of Worship? Can you assign any just and sufficient Cause *ex Natura rei*, why such a way of Worship should not be allowed?

10. Do you deal *Impartially*, while you complain, p. 112. that no bounds are set to the Peoples Fancies of purer Administrations; (concerning which I am quite mistaken, if I did not with the Rector of Sutton had cautioned what he said) and you on the other hand, set no Bounds, but (by your excepting against what Mr. B. hath written of it) would have People own, and commit the care of their Souls to such Ministers, as are in place, be they never so profane, insufficient, or unsound? Tho Mr. Cheyney (*Full Answer, &c. Introduc.* p. 7.) grants, *That where God doth make a difference, Men may. Now God doth make a difference* (says he) *between the Ministry of the best and the worst, between the Ministry of a John Baptist and a Pharisee, a living Man and an Image.* P. 177. Say you, 'And doth this Kindness only belong to some of our Parochial Churches? &c. Where you suppose every Parochial Church in *England* to be a true Church, and every Parochial Minister (by consequence) to be a true Minister; unless you would argue fallaciously there. Tho I had thought it possible to have found out some few at least, whom you would have been ashamed to own. I cannot but wonder at that you urge again and again. p. 111. 'Were they not baptized in this Church, and received into Communion with it as Members of it? p. 148. 'Our Business is with those, who being baptized in this Church, &c. May not all those that were baptized in *Presbyterian*, or *Independent Congregations*, as well plead their Baptism, for their continuing in that way of Worship, which was in the Church, wherein they were baptized? Or would you have such Re-baptized? Or can you prove, that unless Men renounce their Baptism, they must needs own *Diocesan Churches*, and the Parish-Minister (howsoever unqualified) whom the Bishop sets over them?



You that could find out a *Mean betwixt Tyranny over Mens Consciences, and endless Separation*, to wit, a prudent and due *Submission in lawful things*, ( as pag. 208. ) me-thinks it is a little strange, you could think of no *Mean betwixt* tying People to their Parish Minister ( though notoriously unfit for the Ministry, ) and suffering them to run after *Quakers*, or *Papists*, p. 330. I suppose you approve of that Saying of the Bishops, you cite, pag. 320. " If he ( that was chosen ) were worthy, they would consecrate him, but " not otherwise. So you would not have Bishops obliged, or forced to consecrate the *unworthy*, neither surely should they *ordain* such, or grant Institution and Induction to such: Yet I see not, but you would have People obliged to accept of them, if instituted and inducted, though it be never so apparent, and easie to prove, they are unworthy. It would seem, it is enough with you, that *we have the same Religion*, ( publicly professed ) pag. 308. Though some in place are never so great a scandal to Religion, great Enemies to it, whose Ministry tends to do more harm, than good, p. 123.

II. Are you *Impartial*? or rather, are you not *uncharitable* in your Censure of all those, whom you condemn as Separatists, and guilty of Schism? As you say to the Romanist, *Rational Account*, pag. 613. §. 3. *You expressly grant a possibility of Salvation, — in case of invincible Ignorance; and dare you deny it, where there is a preparation of Mind to find out, and embrace the most certain way to Heaven; where all Endeavours are used to that end, and where there is a conscientious Obedience to the Will of God, so far as it is discovered*: So say I to you. But here, do not in Effect charge them, with *not using the best means for a right Information*? otherwise you say their *Non-communication in the Particulars scrupled, may be excused*, ( p. 73. f. ) Therefore say I, their *Non-communication* with you ( who yet acknowledg you to be true Churches ) cannot be the most *inexcusable*, unless you suppose them to be the most deficient in using the means for right Information. Do you not charge them with *wilful Error or Mistake*? p. 373. " There must be *wilfulness* in the Error or Mistake which doth not excuse. For I say expressly, if the Error be wholly involuntary, it does excuse. So you suppose, pag. 140. " That the terms of Communion are only fancied to " be sinful through prejudice, or wilful Ignorance, or Error of Conscience. Where we must understand, you would have [ *wilful* ] joyned to each of these, otherwise it would excuse. And you add, pag. 141. " It is to be " supposed, that where there is no plain Prohibition, Men may with ordinary Care and Judgment, satisfy themselves of the Lawfulness of " things required. Therefore you suppose that all who are not so satisfied, are Men that want both ordinary Care and Judgment, who *suffer themselves to be so easily deluded*, p. 142. f. Here I meet with a *Letter* of some old suffering

suffering *Non-conformists*, ( being an *Answer* to what a Reverend Confor-  
mable Divine had written to them. ) Some Passages therein I shall tran-  
scribe, ( supposing it was never printed; that they may be new to you,  
though written many Years since. )

— The second Course you direct us to, of seeking Information [ but  
with all Humility, and Prayer in the use of means ( but with all Indifferency )  
lest halting with God, as Balaam did, we find his success ) we readily accept  
it, according to the measure of the Truth and Integrity of our Hearts; only we  
have cause to be humbled, and fear our own Hearts ( for we speak of our selves,  
we judge not others ) lest any of us yield without such serious search after the  
Truth, as you advise, and that for fear of losing what Balaam gained. For  
ought we see, there is small hopes of gaining Balaam's way<sup>92</sup> by standing for the  
Purity of God's Ordinances, and therefore lest Fear of halting as Balaam did,  
in seeking and following after that way, which exposeth us to the loss of all the  
chiefest Comforts of this Life, and which if it be not the way of Truth, we are of  
all true-hearted English-men the most miserable. And further on, they say, —  
Or suppose ( which God forbid ) that we were so void of Christianity and Hu-  
manity together, as to undo our selves ( inward and outward Man, without all  
Reason or Conscience; ) yet will you pass the same Judgment upon all those  
three hundred Ministers, which in our memories have been deprived for that very  
Cause, for which we suffer? Were not some of them such, as the Christian  
World never yielded more eminent Lights of Sincerity and true Holiness, since  
the Apostles times? And did Misprision, or long Use make such a fell adoe  
in their Hearts also, as to blind their Consciences in this Cause? Was all  
their Patience in this Cause for Conscience sake, not a Fruit of God's Spirit in  
them, but a Bastard of their own Spirit? ( And Sir, you may be informed,  
how some of them suffered for Preaching and keeping Conventicles, as they  
were called, as well as for In-conformity. ) Afterwards towards the Con-  
clusion, they have these words, Consider whether you rightly take such things  
for indifferent, when they do not suffer you to carry an indifferent Mind towards  
your poor Brethren, which in them only, and in no weightier Matters, do differ from  
you. And let me beg of you to consider it; and once more to consider  
your own words, *Rational Account*, p. 614. " But we have not so learned  
" Christ, we dare not deal so inhumanly with them in this World, much  
" less judg so uncharitably as to another, of those who profess to fear  
" God, and work Righteousness, though they be not of the same Opi-  
" nion or Communion with us. Remember this, unless you will retract  
it.

The last point of *Partiality* I shall take notice of, toucheth me in parti-  
cular, *Preface* p. 61, 62. You say of that worthy Person, ( whosoever he  
was ) who wrote the *Letter out of the Country*, " He seems to write like a  
" well-



“well-disposed Gentleman,— He discourses gravely and piously, without Bitterness and Rancor, or any sharper Reflections, &c. Though he also reflects on your *Irenicum*, yet there is *no harm done*. You have the same from him as it were by *whole-sale*, (almost two Pages together, *Letter*, p. 15, 16.) which I return in *small Parcels*; yet do you not pay Him off with such sharp *Invectives*, as I have from you, *Preface* p. 72.

So now I come to consider what you say to me, *Preface* p. 71. “The whole Design of that Book doth not seem very agreeable to the Christian-temper which the Author pretends to. Whether is it your meaning, that it is *not wholly agreeable*, or *not at all agreeable*? Whether, not agreeable in all things, or agreeable in nothing? But is it not for *Moderation* in such Cases, wherein Moderation ought to be shewn? And is not that very agreeable to the *Christian-temper*? And what may others say now of your *Irenicum*? If what I transcribed thence, seem to you *not agreeable to the Christian temper*, then, was you not under some great Distemper, either at the writing of this latter, or that former Book? In the *Christian-temper* I have Occasion (p. 370.) to borrow something from Bishop Downam; what he noteth to have always been the *Hypocrites Guise*, I there say is the *genius of false Zeal*, Scil. *To neglect the greater Duties, and to affect the Observation of the less; to prefer Circumstances before the Substance, and Ceremonies before the Works, either of Piety or Charity; to place the height of their Religion, either in observing, or urging Ceremonies, or Controversies, in inveighing against them*. And I say further, (p. 371.) *You would not take him for a wise and careful Builder, that laid the greatest Weight on the weakest part of the Wall.— And is that true Zeal for God? Or rather is it not a selfish Zeal, which is for ones own Opinions (or own Party) neglecting those things, which make most for the Honour of God, and wherein the main Interest of Religion lieth*. If I could see any thing there, or in that Book, which chanceth to bear the Name of the Rector of Sutton, that is *not agreeable to the Christian-temper*, and to the Truth, and Doctrine of Christ, I hope I should be ready to retract the same.

*Ibid.* “For it is to pick up all the Passages he could meet with (in a Book written twenty Years since) with great tenderness towards Dissenters, before the Laws were established.

And have you repented of that your former Kindness and Tenderness towards them, since the Laws were against them? But Solomon tells us, *A Friend loveth at all times, and a Brother is born for Adversity*. Which I observed to be agreeable to the *Christian-temper*, (p. 219.) And you cannot deny that which you told us twenty Years since, of the *Magistrates Power* being bounded. *He hath Power of determining things (undetermined by the Word) so they be agreeable to the Word.— His Laws must be regulated by the general*



*Rules of the Divine Law*, ( *Reſtor of Sutton*, p. 12. ) That no Laws of Men can hinder, but what was *Truth*, will be *Truth* ſtill, and what was *Duty*, will be *Duty* ſtill.

In what followeth, you more *humbly* ( as it would ſeem ) than *truly* confeſs ( in Mr. Cotton's words ) the *weakneſs* or *unwarineſs* of thoſe *Exprefſions*, which I have gathered out of your *Irenicum*. That Book was your *First-born*. And the *First-born* was the *chief* of their *Strength*, *Pſal.* 105:36. But it ſeems, you are for reading *Gen.* 49. 3. *Principium doloris*, rather than *Principium roboris*. The *beginning* of your *Strength*, is now become the *beginning* of your *Grief*. Thus you now let the World know indeed, that whereas you had written much, favouring the *Cauſe* of *Diſſenters*, your *Thoughts* at laſt are changed, as to thoſe *Things* and *Perſons* too.

Next you fall hotly on me, [ “ And, have you not very well requited “ the Author of that Book, for the *Tenderneſs* and *Pitty* he had for you, “ and the *Concernment* he then expreſſed, to have brought you upon eaſier “ Terms, &c. ]

*Reverend Sir*, I hope you will give me leave to ſpeak, when I am thus ſpoken to. I ſuppoſe you expect my Answer, when you put *Questions* ſo cloſe to me. Firſt then, I thank you for your *good pains* taken in that Book, and for your *truly Chriſtian Deſign* in it, ſo agreeable to the *Chriſtian-temper*; though it hath been unſucceſſful. I doubt not yet, but that Book will ſtand as a *Wiſneſs* before God and the World againſt many, who can never answer that *Strength of Reaſon* in it, an *Evidence of Truth*, againſt unneceſſary, rigorous, *miſchievous Impoſitions*; and yet were for preſſing, and are ſtill for continuing them upon us. But it is no *ill Requital* of the Author, that I have an eſteem of his Work. And if you can reconcile the *Scope of your Sermon* with what I cite out of your former Writings, do your ſelf that *Right*. Or if you can, refute thoſe *Collections*; otherwiſe ſuch as meet with them may be tempted to think you *ſelf-condemned*.

When you ſay, you wrote in *Tenderneſs*, &c. I hope, you did not only play the Orator, make a flouriſh meerly with Words; or plead our *Cauſe* againſt your own Judgment; nor acted the part of Politician, as hoping to engage a Party; but wrote your Judgment, as a ſober ( and indeed *well ſtudied* ) *Divine*. Will you ſay, you wrote *partially* then, as ſwayed with your *Pitty* and *Tenderneſs* towards *Diſſenters*? How then ſhall we be ſatiſfied, and aſſured, that you have not written *partially* of late, out of overmuch *Fondneſs* on *Conformity*? If you wrote *impartially*, your Judgment, and Reaſon deſerves to be regarded, till you, or ſome other for you, bring greater *Strength of Reaſon* to prove you was then in an Error. You pleaded well for *eaſier Terms*, and what can you ſay now, what have you thought

thought of since to justify *Mens imposing harder Terms*? How can you answer your own Interrogatories, [*What ground can there be, why Christians should not stand upon the same Terms now, which they did in the time of Christ and his Apostles*? And, *whether do they consult the Churches Peace and Unity, who suspend it upon such things, (as you know what?) How far doth the Example of our Saviour or his Apostles warrant such rigorous Impositions?*] Rector of Sutton, pag. 7, 8.

You express your having been concerned to have brought us in,—But were not many of us in, both in the Church, and in the Ministry, before we were put out by the late Impositions? By this expression of yours, it would seem, your Church is a new Church, lately erected, standing upon new Terms, (which I shall have occasion again to take notice of.) But were we not true Ministers before? had we not a valid Ordination? Deny it if you can. And if we were true Ministers before, then it is a great Question, whether we are not so still, (unless you can prove we were justly degraded.) And consequently, whether we are not obliged to the exercise of our Ministry, as we may have opportunity? Preface p. 72. ‘And hath he now deserved this at your hands, to have them all thrown down in his Face, and to be thus upbraided with his former Kindness? Is this your Ingenuity, your Gratitude, your Christian-temper?’

Now are not these pretty sharp Reflections? If you can justly charge me with any Bitterness and Rancor, &c. I shall acknowledg such things not agreeable to the Christian-temper, and would be ashamed of them. If you are ashamed to own your former Principles, many will judg, it is without Cause. It may prove you fallen from those sober Principles, but it will not prove those Principles false.

When you speak of my throwing them in your Face, my Design was not to cast Dirt upon so worthy a Person. What I alledged, I took to be matter of Argument, and with this Advantage, *ad Hominem*. I know no Reason you have to be sorry for what you wrote formerly, tending to Peace and Union, as you may have cause to be sorry for what looks another way. I should have thought, the Method I took (minding you how much you had said against such an established Rule, as you would now bring us under) might have tended to moderate, rather than exasperate you. What if you have since changed your Opinion? Yet me-thinks, you should not judge those former Principles of yours so sinful and dangerous, that none are fit to be tolerated in the Church who hold to them. How happy and glorious would the Church of England be, had she no worse Teachers, than Dr. Stillingfleet was, when he maintained those Principles? Or if you do account them so sinful and dangerous, are you not the more obliged to disprove and refute them? which you will find as hard a Task, as it would have been

to Grotius, had he gone about the *Confutation* of what he had written *de Satisfactione Christi*.

You go on, "Are you afraid of having too many Friends, that you thus use those, whom you once took to be such? Me-thinks herein you appear very self-denying.

I am not careful to answer in this matter. But is it so, that we have quite lost you? Will you no more stand our Friend? *Where is then the Kindness you spake of?* I remember, Dr. Borrel silenced me, when I had been silenced not two Months before: But I could not have thought 20 Years ago, that when we were driven into Corners, Dr. St. would be for driving us out of our Corners too, even he that could plead so well for us, that we might enjoy publick Liberty. Here I look back to that (*Preface*, p. 52.) "They would have had me preached for Alterations and Abatements, and taking away Ceremonies and Subscriptions, — and then I might have been thought to have preached a very seasonable Sermon. This indeed would have shewed, that you was still our Friend, and not ours only, but as good a Friend to this poor Church and Kingdom. To plead for all Abatements that (*with the Honour of God, and safety of true Religion*) might be granted to Dissenters, for the uniting and strengthening of the Protestant Interest, in such danger to be trodden down by the common Enemy, would certainly be more seasonable, than this work you are engaged in.

I would know, whether that Speech of the Bishop of St. David's in the Convocation-House, May 23, 1604, was not seasonable? Can it ever be unseasonable, moving for the due Liberty of grave, honest, sound, and conscientious Men, such as the Church hath need of at all times, and whose Labours might be very profitable? And then, whether pleading for Abatements at this day be not as seasonable? I put a great difference (said he) between *Quid liceat*, and *Quid expediat*, — And then speaking of those who were scrupulous only upon some Ceremonies, and other Circumstances, being otherwise learned, studious, grave and honest Men, whose Labours have been both painful in the Church, and profitable to their several Congregations, (he says) though I do not justify their Doings, yet surely their Service would be missed, at such time as need shall require them, and us to give the right hand of Fellowship one to another, and to go arm in arm against the common Adversary, that so there might be vis unita fortior. — If these our Brethren aforesaid should be deprived of their places for the matters premised, I think we should find Cause to bend our Wits to the uttermost extent of our Skill to provide some cure of Souls for them, where they may exercise their Talents.

Furthermore, If these Men, being divers hundreds (as it is bruited abroad) should forsake their Charges (as some do presuppose they will) who I pray you  
E  
should



should succeed them. — Besides this, for so much as in the Life-time of the late Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, these things were not so extremely urged, but that many learned Preachers enjoyed their Liberty herein, conditionally that they did not by Word or Deed openly disgrace, or disturb the State established; I would know a Reason, why it should now be so generally and exceeding strictly called upon, especially seeing that those Men are now the more necessary, by so much as we see greater Increase of Papists to be now of late, than were before. To conclude, I wish, that if by Petition made to the King's Majesty, there cannot be obtained a quite remove of the Premises, which seem so grievous to divers, nor yet a Toleration for them, which be of the more staid, and temperate Carriage; yet at the least, there might be procured a Mitigation of the Penalty, if they cannot be drawn by other Reasons to a Conformity with us. Thus the Bishop of St. David's. And if all the Bishops in England were of his Mind, and would move for their Ministerial Liberty, whose Service is needful, at such a time as this especially, whether would it not be very seasonable? And if you had a Kindness, and Pity for Dissenters, is there not the same Reason for it still? And is not this very Juncture of Time as good an Occasion, as ever you may have to shew it?

You say further to me, Preface p. 72. "But I cannot take you to be any of the wisest Men upon Earth." And I should wonder if you did. But you know what Diogenes said to one that told him, many mocked him. But (said he) I am not mocked. I might well expect your Contempt, when I see you contemning such, whose Books I am not worthy to carry after them. Yet it may be questioned here, whether you take not your self to be wiser, than the Wisdom of the whole Nation in Parliament, comparing your Preface p. 81, &c. with the declared Sense of that great and honorable Council? Pref. p. 93. you say, "These are all the things which appear to me reasonable to be allowed in order to an Union. So that if they were inclined to have gone further, therein they appeared to you not very considerate, or reasonable."

"When you think it reasonable, that upon longer time, and farther Consideration, those Divines of the Assembly, who then opposed Separation, should change their Opinions: [But where find you this in what I wrote?] "Will you not allow one single Person (but *stipendæ eruditionis Theologum*, as the Latine Apologist then called you, pag. 118.) "Who happened to write about these matters when he was very young; (as you may say, Mr. Joseph Alleyn was very young, when he was very ripe.) "in twenty Years time of the most busy and thoughtful part of his Life, "to see Reason to alter his Judgment? And yet you was as close a Student in that former part of your Life, and as free from other Business, from Diversions, and Temptations, as can be supposed you have been since.

But

But you should be *allowed to alter your Judgment*, and none can blame you, if it be *for the better*. Only in this case, you should be so just, and charitable, as to let us know your Reasons, that if they be found, we may see Cause to alter ours. I hope, you will not say, "Then was then, and now is now. And can you now assure us, that you shall not alter your present Judgment once again within twenty Years?" We read of Bishops that have cried *peccavimus* again and again, and of Councils doing and undoing again, and sometimes in less than twenty Years.

"But after all this, wherein is it that he hath thus contradicted himself? Is it in the point of Separation, which is the present Business? No, so far from it, that in that very Book, he speaks as fully concerning the Unlawfulness of Separation, as in this Sermon, which will appear by these Particulars in it.

If by *Separation*, you mean a Separation from any Church upon any slight, trivial, unnecessary Cause, as you define Schism, *Irenic. p. 113.* I am not for such a Separation. But perhaps some may tell you, that if you separate from such Assemblies as Mr. B. &c. when you might have occasional Communion with them, you do it upon far less Cause, than many separate from those of yours, where they are required to joyn in Practices more to be suspected.

If by *Separation* you mean any assembling for the Worship of God, otherwise than according to your established Rule; and so condemn the Assemblies of meer Non-conformists, that are not of Schismatical Principles; yea, even their occasional Meetings, and those kept off from the times of publick Worship in the Parochial Congregations, I doubt not but the Lawfulness of such Assemblies is, and shall be evidently proved from that Book.

Preface p. 72, 73. Which will appear by these Particulars in it.

(1.) *Irenic. p. 123.* "That it is unlawful to set up new Churches, because they cannot conform to such Practices which they suspect to be unlawful.

(2.) "Those are new Churches, when men erect distinct Societies for Worship, under distinct and peculiar Officers, governing by Laws, and Church-Rules, different from that Form they separate from.

(3.) *P. 124.* "As to things in the Judgment of the Primitive and Reformed Churches left undetermined by the Laws of God, and in matters of meer Order and Decency, and wholly as to the Form of Government, every one, notwithstanding what his private Judgment may be of them, is bound for the Peace of the Church of God, to submit to the Determination of the Church. Allow but these three Conclusions, and defend the present Separation if you can.



*Ad Trianos ventum est*, I hope now we shall come to something. Me-thinks, we have been too long beating about the Bush. And yet I am kept off a while, seeing you taking up a good part of two Pages to no purpose; unless it be to perswade your Readers, that I was unwilling to take notice of that, which you cannot but grant I do take notice of, *viz.* that you distinguish betwixt Non-communication in unlawful, or suspected Rites or Practices in a Church, and entering into distinct Societies for Worship. And it were strange, if I had over-look'd, or was unwilling, the Readers should see these Conclusions of yours, when you cannot but say, I there cite the very Pages, *Reſtor of Sutton* p. 30. And I can say, I gave them what I thought might seem material. They will find but two Conclusions in *Irenicum*; your second Conclusion here is there but an Explication of the first. And what I granted you, is all you can make of them, to your purpose here. And did I not acknowledg, again and again there, that the Primitive and Reformed Churches were two of your Judges? And what Advantage you will get by that, or any of these Conclusions, we shall now see. Me-thinks, I have this Advantage that you here own these three Conclusions. When you would have me to allow them; it is to be supposed, that you allow them your self. Yea, you say of them, *These are most pertinent and material*. Therefore I shall go over them again.

*Conclusion 1.* "That it is unlawful to set up new Churches, because they cannot conform to such Practices, which they suspect to be unlawful."

Here, 1. I urge you with what you say, *Irenic.* p. 117. "Withdrawing Communion from a Church in unlawful or suspected Things, doth not lay Men under the Guilt of Schism. You say, Men may lawfully deny Communion with a Church in such things. I say, Men cannot lawfully have Communion in such things. As *King James*, (on the Lord's Prayer, pag. 44.) *It is a good and sure Rule in Theology, in matters of God's Worship, quod dubitas nē feceris.* So *Hales* (Miscel. of Schism, p. 210.) *Not only in Reason, but in Religion too, that Maxim admits of no Release, Cautionissimi cujusq; præceptum, quod dubitas nē feceris.* And *Mr. R. Hooker*, (Preface to his *Eccles. Polit.* §. 6.) *Not that I judge it a thing allowable for Men to observe those Laws, which in their Hearts they are steadfastly perswaded to be against the Law of God.* What he says further there, of Men being bound to suspend their Perswasion in matters determined by Governours, which they have not demonstrative Reasons against, you very well take off. *Irenic.* p. 118, 119. "No true Protestant can swear blind Obedience to Church-Governours, &c. And certainly, it is neither in a Mans Power to suspend his own Perswasion, or lay aside his Doubts *ad libitum*, nor is he allowed to act against his own Judgment and Conscience

( though



( though mis-informed. ) That Man sinneth without doubt, who ventureth on Practices he suspects to be sinful ( though in themselves the Practices be lawful. ) What the Apostle saith, *Rom 14. 5, 14, 23.* puts the matter out of dispute.

Now to joyn in *Common-Prayer* is an unlawful, or suspected Practice to some. They take it to be polluted with Superstition. Perhaps they take Communion herein to be a sinful Symbolizing with the Papists, for what *King Edward 6,* and *King James* said of it. And if you should tell them our Service-book is reformed; it is possible, some may now reply, How can you say so? Will you *blast the Credit* of, and cast a Reproach upon our *first Reformers*? Again, baptizing with the *Sign of the Cross*, and *kneeling* in the Act of receiving the Sacrament, ( as it were before the Sacramental Elements ) are suspected unlawful Practices to many. And thus they are *barred from Communion* with you in Sacraments. And therefore you had no Reason to slight others modest Expressions here, as you do, *pag. 333.* [ *They judge, they think, they esteem them unlawful, and they cannot be satisfied about them.* ] Though you are far short of answering all that hath been said to prove some things enjoined unlawful; yet suppose a Man ignorant, erring and mistaken here ( not without Fault ) notwithstanding he must *suspend his own Act* till he be better informed, and satisfied about it. And here I would again mind you of those significant Expressions, *Irenic. pag. 119.* " Let Men turn and wind themselves which way they will, by the very same Arguments that any will prove Separation from the Church of Rome lawful, because she required unlawful Things, as Conditions of her Communion, it will be proved lawful not to conform to any suspected or unlawful Practice required by any Church-Governours upon the same Terms, if the Thing so required, be after serious and sober Enquiry, judged unwarrantable by a Man's own Conscience. Which ( with more you have in that Page, and the Page before it ) cuts off your third Particular, *Preface p. 75.* Here now I have gained so much Ground of you. Such are necessitated to withdraw from your Communion, who must otherwise joyn in some unlawful or suspected Practice. As *Chillingworth; p. 269.* *To do ill that you may do well, is against the Will of God, which to every good Man is a high Degree of Necessity.* And say you, *Rational Account, p. 290.* " Can any one imagine it should be a Fault in any to keep off from Communion, where they are so far from being obliged to it, that they have an Obligation to the contrary, from the Principles of their common Christianity. Here I assume, they are bound by the Principles of common Christianity to keep off from Communion with you, that know they should certainly sin, if they held Communion with you, because they should then joyn in suspected Practices, and things, which after Enquiry, their Consciences tell them are unlawful. Ergo,

*Ergo*, you must say, it cannot be a *Fault* in such to keep off from Communion with you. Though I would grant them *faulty so far as* any keep off through Prejudice, Error, Ignorance; yet so far as these are *involuntary*, they are *more excusable*, than to go directly cross to their own Consciences here. So therefore such *are necessitated* to withdraw Communion from you, who would certainly sin, if they held Communion with you, judging such Communion to be sinful.

2. If you say here, What is this to a *positive Separation*, which is the present Business? You shall see, it is something towards it. You are *come a fair Step* on the Way. Once grant that it is lawful for Men ( or that Men are necessitated ) to deny Communion with you in *unlawful*, or ( but ) *suspected Practices*, which are unlawful to them, and you come presently to the Point. Allowing them to withdraw from yours, you must allow them to joyn in some other Christian Assembly; unless you would have them utterly deprived of the Worship of God, and to live like Heathens: As you say well, *Irenic. p. 109.* " Every Christian is under an Obligation to joyn in Church society with others; because it is his Duty to profess himself a Christian, and to own his Religion publicly, and to partake of the Ordinances and Sacraments of the Gospel, which cannot be without Society with some Church or other. So then, Christians that cannot enjoy Sacraments with you, must joyn with some other Society, where they may enjoy them. And further, take notice of that *remarkable Assertion*, in your *Rational Account*, p. 335. and apply it here, as far as there is Cause, " Our Assertion therefore is, that the Church and Court of Rome are guilty of this Schism, — by forcing Men ( *N.B.* ) if they would not damn their Souls by sinning against their Consciences, in approving the Errors and Corruptions of the Roman Church, to joyn together ( *N. B.* ) for the solemn Worship of God, according to the Rule of Scripture, and Practice of the Primitive Church, and suspending ( I suppose it should have been, *and to suspend* ) Communion with that Church till those Abuses and Corruptions be redressed. And I observe further, *Ibid. p. 291.* you would not have Men *bound to Communion with a particular Church*, but in Subordination to God's Honour, and the Salvation of their Souls. Yea, you say, Men are *bound not to communicate in those lesser Societies*, where such things are imposed, as are *directly repugnant* to these Ends. And where Men should be *forced to damn their Souls by sinning against their Consciences*, would not this be *directly repugnant*? And yet are not such bound to joyn together for the Solemn Worship of God, &c. You see now *how far I have brought you, even on your own Grounds*: how you will get off, I know not.

Then



Then might it not have been expected, that you would have been more favourable, and charitable towards the Assemblies of those Ministers and Christians, that are kept off from you by *unlawful Terms*, or at least such *unnecessary Terms* as are to them *unlawful*? You speak more temperately, *Rational Account*, pag. 331. Here let me use some of your own Words there, which something favour those Assemblies, you now engage so zealously against, *By their declaring the Grounds of their Separation to be such Errors and Corruptions, which are crept into the Communion of your Church, and imposed on them in order to it, they withal declare their readiness to joyn with you again, if those Errors and Corruptions be left out.* ¶ And where 'there is this readiness of Communion; there is no absolute Separation 'from the Church as such, but only suspending Communion till such 'Abuses be reformed. This they'l say is very good. But now in your new *Impartial Account*, Preface pag. 46. you speak in another Dialect, 'Would they have had me represented that as no Sin, which I think to 'be so great a one; or those as not guilty, whom in my Conscience I 'thought to be guilty of it? Would they have had me suffered this Sin 'to have lain upon them without reprov'ing it? &c. (What? that which is *as plain a Sin as Murder*, pag. 209. which is *really as great and as dangerous a Sin, as Murder*; and in some respects *aggravated beyond it*, Preface p. 45.) And yet on the other hand, would you have them conform to you, though *against their Consciences*? Would that be *no Sin*? Would God be well-pleased with such Service, as was done but to please Men, while their Consciences (in the mean while) condemned them for it? Can you say *bonâ Fide*, that it is better, more pleasing to God, that Men conform to your *Modes and Ceremonies*, though they have *real Doubts* of Conscience, that they are unlawful; or better, they should *live without God's publick Worship and Ordinances*, then to joyn with such as the *Non-conformists*? That this is *as the Sin of Murder*! Dare you go, or send to all the Dissenters in your Parish (supposing you take them to belong to your Charge) and give 'em it under your hand, that though they are still unsatisfied, (after all you have said and written) though they believe, they should offend God, if they joyned with you upon such Terms; yet I say, durst you give it under your hand, that they would *do better to joyn in your way of Worship*, than in that of the *Non-conformists*; though they have no more doubt of joyning with the latter, than you had heretofore? If you are clear in the Point, have you done this? Or why do you neglect your Duty towards them? Why do you not endeavour to bring them in, or lay the Sin at their Door? But I observe, you would have Care taken, (Preface p. 86.) that there be 'No Pretence left for idle, loose, and profane Persons, never going to any Church at all; whence I conclude, that



that you cannot but allow it, that such as are not satisfied to joyn with you, yet ought to joyn in God's Worship elsewhere: and that *in your serious Thoughts* you judg it better for Persons to joyn with *Congregations, that hold Communion in your way of Worship unlawful* ( for of such you are speaking in that place ) than to be of no Christian Society, than not to attend at all on God's Worship.

Here, if you would not be offended, I shall tell you, what a plain Christian, a Neighbour of mine, said of you; *I can remember, I have seen him at the Sacrament with some of you, ( above 20 Years ago ) and would he now have poor, hungry Souls deprived of such Ordinances and Means of Grace, that cannot be satisfied to partake of them in his Way? If any were a Cause of depriving so many thousands of their bodily Food, as he would have deprived of Food for their Souls, what would the World say of such? Whereby he seemed to think your Sin as great, as Murder, and in some respects, aggravated beyond it. ( As he may likewise think, the Sin of those that care not unnecessarily to offend others, or would cause them to offend, to be a kind of Murder, in the Apostles Account, Rom. 14. 15. — Now walkest thou not charitably? Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died. )* Such was the honest Man's Zeal, he would have written to you, to put it to your Conscience, ( as he said ) but I thought this Intimation from him sufficient.

3. I find you *so kind, or just*, you help such to *Ministers*, those that cannot conform. *Irenic. p. 42*, you say, *It belongs to the Magistrate, 'To see that Ministers preach the true Doctrine, though he cannot lawfully forbid the true Doctrine to be taught; and that they duly administer the Sacraments, though he cannot command them to administer them otherwise than Christ hath delivered them down to us. ( And that Christ did not deliver the Sign of the Cross down to us with Baptism, I suppose the highest Conformists will grant. )* This gives some Hopes, such may *lawfully preach* still, whom others cannot *lawfully forbid Preaching*. And you tell us from another (*Unreasonableness of Separation, pag. 7. )* that *'Cranmer held himself for a Arch-Bishop still, and was by Q. Marry forcibly restrained from it. — Latimer though he renounced his Bishoprick, yet he kept his Ministry, and never repented him of it. And Ibid. p. 132. you say, 'The Question is not, whether all publick Worship be sinful, when forbidden? ( which you never said, or thought, as you tell us in the same Page ) — 'I abhor and detest such Principles, as to set up Man's Laws above God's. This is good. And you seem to allow, that such publick Worship, as hath no Evil in it, antecedent to the Prohibition, may not be forbidden. Very good still. All the Question here is, Whether there be not Schism in it? For I hope, you shall never find Idolatry or Sedition in that Worship, I would plead*

plead for. Now as for the Charge of *Schism*, do but allow Ministers equal Favour with others, and you have said enough to clear them, *Iren. p. 113, 116, 119, 120.* Charge not them with *Schism* upon account of their distinct Meetings, who are driven into them by your over-rigorous Impositions. You know well how great a matter this imposing unlawful Conditions is with *Chillingworth*, to warrant Separation. How oft he is upon it, in *Chap. 5.* where *p. 267. §. 40.* he hath the confidence to tell his Adversary, ' You mistake ' in thinking that Protestants hold themselves obliged not to communicate ' with you only, or principally by reason of your Errors and Corruptions. ' For the true Reason ( according to my third Observation ) is not so much ' because you maintain Errors and Corruptions, as because you impose ' them, &c. ( like your pleading for Non-conformists, *Irenic. p. 118.* ) So Ball of Separation, *pag. 159.* The Lord needeth not Mans lie, neither doth he allow us to do Evil that Good may come thereof : And therefore I must not subscribe to an Error against Conscience, though never so innocent, nor profess Approbation of that which in Conscience I cannot allow, though never so small, &c. But thus are many Ministers driven from you, who neither dare lay down their Ministry, nor take the charge of Parochial Congregations on them, upon such hard, that is, sinful Terms. For ( to borrow an Expression of Dr. Potter's ) Though in the issue the Errors be not damnable to them, which believe as they profess, yet for us to profess, &c. what we believe not, were without question damnable.

Now may I come in with my Conclusion : It is this.

Conclusion 1. It becomes unavoidably necessary for such Ministers and Christians as cannot in Conscience submit to your Terms, and conform to your way of Worship, neither may lawfully lay aside their Ministry, nor live without God's Worship and Ordinances, to be for other Assemblies than yours, where the one may exercise their Ministry, and the other ( with such Ministers ) may partake of God's Ordinances, and joyn in his Worship, which you call setting up of new Churches. After the drawing up of this, looking into *Corbet* of Church-Unity and Schism, I find something to this purpose, *pag. 31, 32.* Though indeed I took my Hints from you here.

Now because I would not leave this Proposition so naked, as yours stands, I shall here offer something, 1. On the behalf of Ministers. 2. On the behalf of private Christians

I. On the behalf of such Ministers.

1. You cannot deny, but the Ministers, who are forced to stand off from you, were ( at least very many of them ) duly qualified for, and had a sufficient, valid call to the Office of the Ministry, that they were God's Ministers, Christ's Ministers, before their Ejection. You cannot deny, but the mediate Call is from God, and Christ, even as well as the immediate



Call was. Those two Texts, *Act. 20. 28.* & *Cor. 12. 28.* ( to name no more ) fully prove it.

2. Though it is not questioned by us, but the *Clergy is under the Jurisdiction of the Prince*, Ministers ( as well as others ) under the Civil Magistrate, and that they may ( *where there is just Cause* ) by him be deprived of their publick Liberty, and may be imprisoned, banished, put to death ; yet *without just Cause* ( as *Male-administration, or matter of Scandal, rendring them unfit*, to use your own Words ) no Power on Earth ( whether Civil or Ecclesiastical ) may turn those out of the Ministry, whom God hath called to it. Rulers, Bishops may neither put in, nor put out of this Office, as they list. Men may neither admit into, nor put from the Ministry, meerly at their their own Pleasure, but only *according to Christ's Will and Appointment*. For his Officers and Servants they are. And Christ hath, by his Apostles ( whose Authority is certainly Superior to that of the greatest Bishops and Councils that ever were ) *described the Office*, and how Persons are to be qualified for it. And when such have been called to the Office, while they give *no just Cause* for Suspension and Degradation, Christ looks on them as *his Ministers* still, and accordingly his Will is that Men own them *as such*. And *they that despise them*, may therein ( in a Degree ) be *guilty of despising Christ*. Chemnitius ( *Loc. com. par. 3. p. 136. col. 1.* ) speaks fully to the purpose, thus ; *As God alone properly claims to himself the Right of Calling, even when the Call is mediate ; so also properly it belongs to God to remove one from the Ministry. Therefore so long as God suffers in the Ministry his Servant teaching rightly, and living blamelessly, Ecclesia non habet Potestatem alienum Servum amovendi, The Church hath no Power ( Authority ) of putting away another's Servant. But when he no further edifies either by his Doctrine, or Life, but destroys the Church, then God himself removes him.*

3. If what you have said formerly ( remark'd in *Reſtor of Sutton*, p. 29. ) hold true, ( and you have not hitherto disproved the same ) then you must yield, the present *Non-conformist* Ministers have not been *suspended*, and cast out *for any just Cause*. And may I not also add, If *Clement* say true, as you cite him here, ( *Unreasonableness of Separation*, p. 314, 315. ) ' Those therefore who were appointed by them, or other eminent Men, ' the whole Church being therewith wel-pleased, discharging their Office ' with Humility, Quietness, Readiness, and Unblameableness, and being ' Men of a long time of good Report, we think such Men cannot justly ' be cast out of their Office. Though in the heat of Disputation, your *Opinion seems to be changed of Persons*, as well as *Things* ; yet I hope in cool Blood you would not deny, but such a Character agrees to many *Non-conformists* ; that you should think, they *cannot justly be cast out of Office*.



Office. And I doubt not, but you are well acquainted with that *old Canon*, *That no Bishop or Priest should be taken into another's Place, if the former were blameless.*

4. If still they are in Office, as *Ministers of Christ*, are they not obliged to serve him in that Office, as they have a Call and Opportunity? (See again *Rector of Sutton*, pag. 29, 34, 75.) They must not neglect the Gift that is in them. Sad was the Doom of the *unprofitable Servant*, that buried his Talent! The *Teacher* must wait on Teaching. I suppose, all Christ's Ministers are concerned in that solemn Charge, 2. *Tim.* 4. 1, 2. And they are to take heed to the Ministry, which they have received; even though Men forbid them. You *abhor and detest such Principles, as to set Man's Laws above God's Laws.* And though they be threatened with Persecution for it; when they are *persecuted in one City*, they may flee to another, *Mat.* 10. 23. Yet must they not run away from their Work, but be carrying that on in other Places, where they come, according to their Ability and Opportunity. Prudence directed them, *Joh.* 20. 19. to meet privately there, at Evening, keeping the Door shut, for fear of the Jews; yet meet they would. If Ministers be driven from their former Flocks, yet are they *Men in Office*, and preach as such, not only as *gifted Men*, in what other place soever God (by his Providence) calls them to bestow their Pains. They are Teachers by Office, to more than their proper Charges, even to as many as they have a Providential Call, *hic & nunc*, to preach unto.

So it appears, Men cannot lawfully silence Christ's Ministers, without just Cause; or if they do, that such Decree and Sentence does not oblige Conscience. I have it from Mr. B. *Church History*, p. 446, 447. The *Dominican Inquisitor* that reasoned the matter with the *Bobemians*, would have silenced, excommunicated Priests bound to cease preaching: but had the wit to add [if silenced for a reasonable Cause,] and to confess, *Sententia injuste lata à suo judice, si Errorem inducat, vel Peccatum mortale afferet, nec tenenda est, nec tenenda.* The old *Bobemian Reformers* held, (as *Ibid.* p. 446.) Every Priest and Deacon is bound to preach God's Word freely, or he sinneth mortally; and after Ordination he should not cease, no, not when excommunicated, because he must obey God rather than Man. I see in *Carranza* (fol. 437.) It was one of the Articles, for which the Council of *Constance* sentenced *J. Wickliffe's* Bones to be digg'd up and burnt, (*Art.* 13.) They that leave off to preach, or hear God's Word for Men's Excommunication, are excommunicate: And you (that have greater store of Authors, and choice Books, than such as I must ever hope to have the Advantage of; you, I say) I doubt not have, what others add; they are excommunicate, and in the day of Judgment shall be judged Traitors to Christ. And these were among the

Articles, for which *J. Hulse* was condemned, *Carranza*, fol. 440. *Art.* 17, 18. *A Priest of Christ living according to his Law, and having the Knowledge of the Scripture, and a working to edify the People, ought to preach notwithstanding any pretended Excommunication. And, every one that comes to the Office of a Priest, hath a Command to preach, and ought to obey that Command, notwithstanding Excommunication. And these you know were before our oldest Non-conformists.*

5. But now ( Sir ) that I may come home to you : If Ministers were bound to cease preaching, to lay aside their Ministry, when silenced unjustly, then at *what a miserable Loss* might the Church be left ? And if you could scarce satisfy your selves to see her at such a loss, we may very well hope, Christ would not have her left at such a Loss. His care of his Church ( no doubt ) is greater than yours would be.

Because you seem not to take any notice of what I said, ( *Rect. of Sutton*, p. 28. ) give me leave here to mind you of it again. What a *woful Case* the Church was in, if she might be *deprived* of all, or the greatest and foudest part of her Ministers at *Man's pleasure* ? And further, *pag.* 43. I put a Case, shewing that if what you would have, be admitted, it might *fare a great deal the worse* with the Church under *Orthodox Bishops*, ( and Governours ) than if they were *grand Hereticks*. But to come to the Point I aim at ; You know when almost two thousand Ministers were cut off from their publick Ministerial Work ( as it were ) in one day, by a Law of Conformity. Now let us suppose the Minds of Rulers to change ( which is not naturally impossible ) and put the case that your Conformity should be made *as great a Crime*, as Non-conformity hath been, and yet, ' the true Religion acknowledged, and the true Doctrine of Faith owned, ( as you say here, *pag.* 148. §. 6. ) Though I find *Mr. Phil. Nye*, ( who is a very considerable Person with you, *Preface*, p. 27. ) In his *Beams of Light*, *pag.* 192. saying, *Let the same Impositions and Penalties be put into the other Scale, against Episcopacy and Ceremonies : If the Law had said, it shall be the loss of a Man's living to practise or preach for Episcopacy, Common-Prayer-Book, or Ceremonies ; these things even in their own Opinions would have been light as Vanity*, ( p. 193. ) Yet for what you say, *Preface*, p. 89. I am to suppose, he was under a mistake. For we must *not think* ( as you tell us there ) ' that the Friends of the Church of England will be either afraid, or ashamed to own her Cause, — or that you will give up the Cause of the ' Church, — so as to condemn its Constitution, or make the Ceremonies unlawful, which have been hitherto observed and practised in it. Now suppose ye were all *outed of your Livings*, because ye could not, or would not declare your Assent and Consent to the *utter abolishing* of such things ; I beseech you, tell us sincerely, what you would do in such a Case, and

and would have others of your Brethren to do? Do you judg it the *Duty of Pastors* to go on in *passing a just Censure* ( though *against the Will of the Magistrate*, as I urged you with it, *Reſtor of Sutton*, p. 76.) and yet would you *wholly lay aside the Office of the Ministry*, and preach the Gospel no more, rather than cōſs his Will? Would ye think your ſelves no more concerned to endeavour to *keep up the Exercise of true Religion* ( as you might ) when it was *against the Will of the Magistrate*? If only ſuch as the *Non-conformiſts* were in place, you would be forced to confeſs, that, ‘ The true Religion was yet maintained and preached in publick ‘ *Asſemblies*, ( as pag. 136. ) And that there was an *Agreement in all the ‘ Subſtantials of Religion*, between you and them; and therefore ( according to your arguing, pag. 132. ) you *could not exerciſe* ( though more privately ) when *turn’d out of your Livings*, but *ſuch Faults as Sedition, or Schiſm, &c.* would be found in your Meetings. *Make the Caſe of Diſſenters your own*, ſuppoſe your ſelves in the like Circumſtances, and I doubt not, you will ſee cauſe to judg more favourably of them. Do but allow them to do, as you would do your ſelves in the like Caſe, and I hope, this Diſpute will ſoon be at an End.

Here I ſhall take off all you ſay to that Queſtion I propoſed, *Reſtor of Sutton*, p. 26. ‘ And may it not be a Queſtion, whether they can properly ‘ be ſaid to erect New Churches, or to proceed to the forming of ſeparate ‘ Congregations, who were true Miniſters, and had their Congregations ‘ before others came into their places? If they had done nothing ( N. B. ) ‘ worthy of Ejection, or Excluſion from their Miniſtry, whether they have ‘ not ſtill a Right to exerciſe their Function? &c. You might have done well to have joyned my *Tenth Query* ( pag. 3. ) with it, and to have conſidered both together. But what ſay you to this? *Unreaſonableneſs of Separation*, p. 137. ‘ There is not one word in all this Plea, but might ‘ have equally ſerved the Papiſts in the beginning of the Reformation. How Sir! Are you in good earneſt? ‘ Not one word but might equally have ‘ ſerved the Papiſts? Why, certainly you wrote in haſte, and forgot your ſelf; or elſe it is your Judgment, that the *Popiſh Biſhops and Priests had done nothing worthy of Ejection, or Excluſion from their Offices*, that they had ſtill a Right to exerciſe their Functions. And yet you argue it, ( *Rational Account*, pag. 379. ) that they *were juſtly deprived*. How can theſe things ſtand together? ‘ They had done nothing worthy of Ejection, ‘ and yet were juſtly deprived. You ſeem to have a great Conceit of this *poor Shift*; we had it but a Page or two before, pag. 135. ‘ The Papiſts ‘ then had the very ſame Plea, that theſe Men have now. So you muſt ſay, and argue thus, *The Miniſters of Antichriſt* ( and thoſe ſuch as were *State-Incendiaries* too ) might *juſtly be caſt out by Law*; ergo, ſo may true  
Ministers.



*Ministers of Christ*, (though peaceable, and loyal.) I grant the Antecedent, but do you prove the Consequent.

But what have you further to say to me ? For indeed what you have yet said here, is *worse than nothing*. But in what follows, the Reader may think, you had a good mind to *pay me home*. 'For the Law signifies nothing with them in any Case, where themselves are concerned. If Ministers be ejected without or against Law, they who come into their places are no Usurpers ; and if they are cast out by Law, they that succeed them are Usurpers ; so that the Law is always the least thing in their Consideration.

Now I thank you for this. But is there here *no sharp Reflection* ? Do you not here bewray *some undecent Passion*, which you so condemn others for ? Are not these things *invidiously* spoken ? Would you not here be *raking into old Sores*, &c. contrary to what you say in your *Preface*, p. 44, 45 ? But did you think to pinch me here, who never was in a *sequestred Living*, nor my predecessor before me ; but came in upon the choice of the People, none opposing ? You thought to give us *a dry Blow* here, never considering that it would reach as many, if not more Conformists ; though it could not once touch him, you seem especially to direct it to.

But thus far of Ministers exercising, though silenced, if silenced *for no just Cause*. Now,

II. To say something on the behalf of the People that hear them.

1. They are *under an Obligation to worship God in Society* with other Christians, with respect to God's Glory, and their own Edification, and Salvation. They are charged, *not to forsake the assembling of themselves together*. And commanded to be *swift to hear*.

2. The way is blockt up so, as many cannot come to your Assemblies, unless (to use your own Phrase) you would have them *damn their Souls by sinning against their Consciences*. And if you judge it better for such to want the ordinary means of Salvation, than to enjoy them, by joyning with *Non-conformists*, we must take you to be *no more infallible* herein, than that *Popish Council*, that decreed it *righter to remain without visible Communion, than to have it with those they call Hereticks*.

3. Some ( though they could dispense with the *Liturgy and Ceremonies*, yet ) cannot satisfy themselves to take up under some *Parish-Ministers*, who are *apparently* no way qualified for the work they take upon them. I take the 9th Canon of the Council of Nice, to be for nulling the Ordination of such as are *scandalous*, or *insufficient*. You are not for the People's *choosing their Pastors* ; but it is evident and undeniable, that they are to *refuse* some. *Beware of false Prophets*. Beware of them, *i. e. fly from their Communion, and have nothing to do with them* ( as you say, p. 215. ) They are to flee

free from Corrupt Teachers, as from *Wolves*. As the People forsook *Pho-*  
*tinus*, of whom *Vincent Lyrinen* (adv. hæres. c. 16. p. 42.) saith, *Nam*  
*quem antea quasi arietem Gregis sequebantur, eundem deinceps veluti Lupum fu-*  
*gere ceperunt*, (which you have also noted, *Irenic*. p. 115.) Some are *blind*  
*Guides*. And may not People very well be startled with what Christ saith  
concerning such? *If the Blind lead the Blind, both shall fall into the Ditch*.  
And have you forgotten, or have you retracted that, in *Answer to Several*  
*Treatises*, p. 265. (cited in *Rector of Sutton* p. 61.) ‘Men may have reason  
‘to question, if not the Skill, yet the Sincerity of their Guides, and  
‘though they must have some, may seek new ones. — The ignorant fol-  
‘low their Guides only upon the opinion of their Skill and Integrity; and  
‘when they see reason to question these, they know of no Obligation to  
‘follow their Conduct over Rocks and Precipices. And yet is it now a *loose*  
*Principle*? some the People are to *mark and avoid*, Rom. 16. 17. some they  
must not *bid God speed*, 2 Joh. v. 10, 11. ‘There are three Cases, (you say  
*Unreas. of Sep.* p. 213.) ‘wherein the Scripture allows of Separation. The  
‘second, is (p. 214.) In case of false Doctrine being imposed instead of true.--  
‘If any Teachers offer to bring another Gospel, or to corrupt the  
‘true one, St. Paul denounces an *Anathema* against them: and that im-  
‘plies, that they should have no Communion with them, &c. Now do  
you not here make the People *Judges of such Heretical Teachers*, whom  
(I suppose) by an *Ironie* you call *admirable Judges*? p. 123. Yet for them  
to own and incourage such, is to *partake of their Evil Deeds*. If Mr. B.  
saith, as you have it there, [ *Any one whose Ministry is such as tendeth to*  
*Destruction more than to Edification, and to do more harm than good, is not to*  
*be owned*; ] I wonder what you have to say for such, when better may  
be had? *Camero* speaks to the same purpose, as Mr. B. (pag. 327. col. 1.)  
*Si non faciant quod spondet tanti Muneris professio deferendi sunt, nam paren-*  
*dum Deo potius quam Hominibus; ut si quis Medicinam professus, &c.* If any  
one having professed *Physick*, should not cure, but exasperate the *Disease*, truly  
he should be forsaken, and another is to be chosen in his room. And what *Peter*  
*Martyr* says, ( *Loc. com.* p. 909. §. 33.) may fitly be applied here, *Vexant*  
*præterea nos, quod non publica sed privata disceſserimus Authoritate, neq; consi-*  
*derant, Deum cuiq; mandasse, ut propriam salutem curet.* This you cannot  
deny, but God has commanded every one to have a care of his Soul, and  
that Men are not bound to lesser Societies (as to their own Parishes, or  
Parish-Ministers,) but so far as may stand with promoting the Salvation  
of their own Souls.

Who could speak more fully than you have done, *Rational Account*,  
p. 611. The main thing to be discussed, is, *Whether the Communion of your*  
*Church or ours, be rather to be chosen in order to Salvation?* — The tendency to  
that

that ought to be the Rule, by which we should embrace or continue in the Society of any Church. Since the Regard Men ought to have of their eternal Welfare doth oblige them to make choice of the best means ; — the bare remote possibility of Salvation, — ought to have no force in determining their Choice in a matter of so great Importance.

4. Many have not the least Doubt, or Scruple, but those Ministers which you would not have them to hear, are such as God hath owned, and still doth, blessing their Ministry to their own, and others Souls Benefit. Many are well assured, *The Lord hath not yet forsaken that Ministry, you would have them forsake.* Yea, I have spoken with some on their Death-Bed, who have sadly bewailed it as a great Sin of theirs, that lay as an heavy Burthen on them, ( and we use to say, *Hora mortis est hora Veritatis* ) That they had despised, and neglected the Ministry of such. But it seems, had they made their Complaints to you, you could soon have satisfied them, telling them, *It was no Sin at all ; but they had done well, in refusing to hear such, as submitted not to the Orders of the Church.* Though perhaps they would have thought it very strange, that you could have allowed them to hear Romish Priests, and yet should suppose it unlawful for them to hear Non-conformists.

5. These would also wonder, if you your self should at all question such Ministers being true Ministers of Christ, and that Worship ( wherein they joyn ) being true Religious Worship ; they are confident you could not but acknowledg the truth of both these, *did but the Law of Man allow them.* And then for ought they know, they are such in themselves, and in God's Account. For no Law of Man could make that to be true, religious Worship, which is not so, abstracted from the Consideration of the Law's Allowance. No Law of Man could make those to be true Ministers of Christ, who are not such, or would otherwise be none.

6. Because I suppose, you will be ready to object here, ' How is it possible for Order to be kept up, if People may run after what Teachers they please ? I desire you to do me right ; I am only for their hearing such as they have reason to believe are allow'd of God, whom therefore Men should allow to preach the Word. And where the publickly allowed Minister is not such a one, they are not bound ( for order-sake ) to neglect other faithful and sound Teachers, and therein also to neglect their own Souls. There is no Order Men can make in the Church, that should be urged, or stood upon against the end of Order, against the Honour of God, against Religion, and the true Service and Worship of God, and against the Salvation of Men, and the ordinary means thereof. And if the Sabbath was made for Man, ( as Mar. 2. 27. ) and therefore was not to be turned to his Destruction ; much less should any human, external Order



Order be strictly urged and pressed to Men's Destruction. Bishop Bilson (*Christian Subject*, part 3 p. 299. An. 1586.) speaking to that, [*We would have things done in order*] returns this smart Answer, *Call you that Order, where Christ shall stand without doors, till your Clergy consent to bring him in?* Though according to the order of Nature, light Bodies move upwards, and heavy Bodies tend downwards in their ordinary Course; yet (which *Camero* applies to a like case, p. 581. col. 1. §. 2.) this very order of Nature is inverted, *Nè detur vacuum*. Here I call to mind what you say, (pag. 198.) 'Is Schism indeed become such an inconsiderable and petty Inconvenience? And me-thinks, that *Inconvenience*, the Breach of external Order (which with you is *Schism*) is a far less Evil, if it be Evil in this case, compared with the *Mischief* of Men's destroying their own Souls, or neglecting the means of their Salvation. There is an higher Law, which (to use the words of *Camero*) *Ordinem deferere jubet ut extremo malo & irreparabili jactura occurratur, &c.* And *qui tam justâ & urgente occasione ordinem deserit, reipsâ non deserit, sed servat*. And that Instance he gives there is convincing, *If a Souldier knew his Captain, his Leader, was for opening the Gates to the Enemy, and yet followed such a Leader, keeping Rank and Order so unseasonably, he would shew himself a Traitor, rather than a faithful Souldier.*

The Disciples would seem to have been for Order there (as you are) when they were hindring Christ's Service, *Mar. 9. 38. Luk. 9. 49. Master, we saw one casting out Devils in thy name,—and we forbid him, because he followeth not us.* Now I heartily wish, even for your own sake, from that true and due Respect I owe to you, that you would more impartially examine what you have been doing, and reflect upon your self; consider seriously, whether you are not forbidding, and condemning some, as faithful Followers of Christ as your self, even in their serving Christ, and serving their Generation? What are your Thoughts of such, as *Jospeh* and *Richard Alleyn*, with divers others that might be named, who kept to their ministerial Work, and (as you say of *Father Latimer*) *never repented them of it?* If now they have that *Well-come home, Well done good and faithful Servants, enter into the Joy of your Lord.*] How far are they above all your Censures? And me-thinks, it deserves Men's serious Consideration, whether they pray as they ought [*Thy Kingdom come*] or whether indeed they act not against their own Prayers, who endeavour to hinder the preaching of the Gospel, (a means of enlarging and building up God's Kingdom?) And as you declare to the World, (p. 394.) you are *one that believes a day of Judgment to come*, (which I would not once question) I beseech you, Sir, think well of what that *well-disposed Gentleman* (as you call him) says, (I think gravely and piously) *Letter out of the Country,*

pag. 38, 39.) Let us bring the Cause before our Supreme and Final Judge. And bethink your self whether of these two things he will be most likely to have regard unto, the saving of Souls, which He bought with his Blood; or the preserving inviolate certain Humane Institutions and Rules, confessed by the Devisers of them, not to be necessary, &c. And so much of your first Conclusion, and mine.

Your second Conclusion follows, *Preface*, p. 73.

2. 'Those are new Churches, when Men erect distinct Societies for Worship, under distinct and peculiar Officers, governing by Laws, and Church-Rules different from that Form they separate from.'

Here, 1, I cannot but look on you as very unfortunate, unhappy in this Cause you have espoused. How oft do you greatly expose your self, that what you urge against your Brethren may justly be retorted on you? So here, how plain is it, that you look but on one side, (which as I remember you suppose those that differ from you to be faulty in?) Had you not one Thought, that if you owned such a Conclusion as this, I should be likely to tell you, you had spoiled your Cause, *Nihil quod nimis, satis*, that by proving too much, you would in effect prove nothing of that you aim at? Should you not have considered, what an Argument you here put into the Mouths of the Dissenters against the National Church of England, against Diocesan Churches, and against Parochial Churches too?

1. Will not many be ready to tell you, that it follows undeniably from this Conclusion of yours, that you have made the National Church of England; and the Diocesan Churches therein, *New* (unlawful) Churches; because under divers peculiar Officers, governing by Laws and Church-Rules different from the Apostolical Primitive Church, (as from other Reformed Churches.) If those are new, unlawful Schismatical Churches with you, that are under distinct and peculiar Officers, governing by Laws, and Church-Rules different from the Apostolical truly Primitive Churches, (as I suppose it must come to that, *Primum in unoquoque genere est Regula & Mensura reliquorum*) what work have you made here? What an heavy Task, and hard Province have you taken on you? Can you ever prove, that there are no Officers, Laws, Rules and Orders in your Church, different from what were in the true Primitive Church? Can you ever find all these Officers, Arch-Bishops, Lord-Bishops, Deans, Chancellors, &c. down to Apparitors, in the Primitive Church? Will you undertake to find there all our Ecclesiastical Canons, even Rules for kneeling in the Act of Receiving, for signing with the Cross in Baptism, for excluding the Parents, and setting God-Fathers and God-Mothers in their stead, with a Rule for peculiar, appropriate Vestments, &c.



To say here, that though you have peculiar Officers, Laws, and Rules, different from the Apostolical Primitive Church; yet you do not *own your selves to be a Church, separate from that Primitive Church*, will not bring you off. For, this many Dissenters likewise say, they separate not from you, but *hold Communion with you in all that is necessary*; and further have more *Local, Presential Communion* with you, than you can pretend to have with the Primitive Church. Yet you will have their Assemblies separate Churches, while they worship God by any other Rule than yours, though their Worship be as agreeable to the Scripture-Rule. And yet can you, or any mortal Man prove, that others may not be *allowed to differ from you in such things, wherein you differ from the Apostolical, primitive Church?*

Again, it will as little help you to say, That you speak of particular Congregations, or Societies for Worship. For,

2. Do you not here make your *Parochial* Congregations also *New Churches*? If the Primitive Church had not your *Liturgy*, were not bound to the use of your *Book of Common-Prayer*, then you cannot deny, but you are under a somewhat *different Rule*. And are there not some Parishes, that have only *Deacons* to officiate? And may I not be bold to tell you, that you can never prove your *Deacons* the same with those in the Churches erected by the Apostles? According to *F. Paul Sarpi. (of matters Benefic. N. 27.)* *Deacons* were *Ministers of temporal things*. You your self say, p. 311. 'It was no properly Church-power which they had; but they were *Stewards of the common Stock*. Then are not *Deacons*, that are allowed to *preach*, and *baptize*, &c. *different Officers*? By this time I hope, you will be sensible, what a Wound you have given to the Cause, you take upon you to defend, by this Conclusion, which is my first Note upon it.

(2.) At the first view and reading of this your second Conclusion, I was willing to hope, that then you would not condemn such Assemblies as Mr. B's. who leave the *ruling Work* to you, and are glad if they be permitted to preach and hear God's Word, and do not separate from you, but joyn with you, even in Sacraments, as well as other parts of God's Worship. But looking farther into your Book, I see my Mistake: For you say, pag. 98. (as was cited before) 'No Man denies, that more places for Worship are desirable, and would be very useful, where &c. But is it possible that Mr. B. should think the Case alike, where the Orders of our Church are constantly neglected, the Authority of the Bishops is slighted and contemned? *Tacito cetera.*

Now I had thought, you might have granted more places for Worship, not only *desireable*, and *useful*, but *very necessary* for such as cannot come to yours, as far as the Apostle makes bearing of the Word necessary, Rom. 10. 14, 17.



more necessary than *unnecessary Modes of Worship*, or such matters as you count but *indifferent things*. But by what is here last cited, it is too plain and manifest, that you *condemn all Religious Assemblies in England*, that follow not your *Church-Rule*, and *own not the Authority of the Bishops*. And thus it seems, where you are zealous in words for *Communion*, yet *Subjection* to the Bishops Authority, is the thing you drive at. And upon this Account, though your Discourse was *calculated chiefly for the City of London*, yet it may *indifferently serve for all other Places and Meetings in England*, where your Church-Rules and Orders are not observed and obeyed. As to our grief, we in the Country have found many of the conformable Clergy, with others, improving your Authority and Arguments as far as they are able, even against such Assemblies, as meet off from the times of the Parochial Congregations meeting, that they might not be censured to meet *in opposition*. These are separate Meetings with you, as well as others; because the *Orders of the Church are neglected* in them. But,

(3.) What will you say of those Assemblies, where Christ taught, and the Disciples likewise whom he sent forth? Did they do this, as *under the Inspection and Government of the Rulers* that then were? Were they tyed up to the *Church-Rules* of the Jews in what they did? were they not *distinct and peculiar Officers*? Certainly, you mince the matter, when you say, *pag. 163.* 'Our Saviour himself did only Teach his Disciples occasionally, and at certain Seasons. As if he taught but rarely, or seldom. And as if he was content with his Disciples only to be his Hearers. (As you would have the silenced Ministers think it enough, if they have *three or four besides the Family.*) whereas we read of Christ's teaching the *Multitude*, and of the *Multitude pressing upon him* to hear. And when he sent forth the Twelve, *Mat. 10.* *preaching* was a good part of their Work. And the *Miracles* they wrought; were to *seal and confirm their Doctrine*. So the Seventy, (*Luk. 10.*) were to *teach*. So much is implied, *ver. 16.* He that *heareth you, heareth me*; and he that *despiseth you, despiseth me, &c.* Now what will you make of them, and their Hearers? Here were *distinct and peculiar Teachers, not under the Government of the Jewish Church-Rulers*: Then, were they *new (unlawful) Churches*? I know you will not say it. But if you say here, though they *differed in some things from the Form of the Jewish Church*; yet they did not *separate*. Well, grant that; yet consider, whether this Example may not justify those, who ordinarily joyn with their Parochial Congregations, in hearing *Non-conformists* at other times? And may it not justify those *Non-conformist Ministers*, that do not separate from the Parochial Congregations? And how many more such would be seen, even in *Corporations*; but for the *five Miles Act*, which forbids their open Appearance in such Places? And yet do you never distinguish.

distinguish betwixt such, and others (that I can find,) but all are alike to you. Yea, so far are you from favouring these, that sometimes you would have the Sin of those that *own you for true Churches*, and have Communion with you, as far as they can, to be *aggravated*, and more *inexcusable*, in having other *distinct* (which you account *separate*) Meetings.

*Ball against Can (part. 1. p. 82.) Neither did our Saviour, nor his Disciples before his Death, take upon them to erect a new visible Church, altogether distinct from the erring Synagogue, but lived in that Church, and frequented the Ordinances, neither as absolute Members of the Synagogue, nor yet as the visible Church distinct from it: But as visible Members of that primitive Church, from which that Synagogue had degenerated.*

I find you so hard, and unyielding in this Controversy, I should be glad, if you would grant a little here, (which I wonder how you can so stiffly deny) in hopes of more in time.

(4.) As you know our Reformers pleaded, that (in their departure from Rome) they *forsook not the Church, but approached nearer to the Catholick, and Primitive Church* (as P. Martyr *Loc. Com. p. 915.*) So those Christian Assemblies, you censure as *new* (unlawful) Churches, because not *under your Rule*, suppose you have censured them rashly here, if in their Worship they are *nearer the Scripture-Rule*. And truly (Sir) you *speak so home*, and fully to the purpose (*Rational Account, p. 356, 357.*) as is quite beyond the power and reach of my poor Imagination to conceive, how you can ever answer your self. There you say, ‘Supposing any Church (tho pretending to be never so Catholick) doth restrain her Communion within such narrow and unjust Bounds—’ ‘Whatever Church takes upon her to limit and inclose the bounds of the Catholick, becomes thereby divided from the Communion of the Catholick Church: and all such who disown such an unjust inclosure, do not so much divide from the Communion of that Church so inclosing, as return to the Communion of the Primitive and Universal Church. How will Dissenters thank you for this? Methinks, I have some hope that we shall in time be agreed, that we shall have you (who do so clearly understand and apprehend what *Schism* there is in any Churches *limiting and inclosing the bounds of the Catholick Church*; shall we not have you) again pleading for *Catholick Terms*? And you say further, *ibid. p. 357.*—‘The disowning of those things wherein your Church is become *Schismatical*; cannot certainly be any culpable Separation. For, whatever is so, must be from a Church so far as it is *Catholick*; but in our case it is from a Church so far only as it is not *Catholick, &c.* While such Passages (so greatly befriending Dissenters, that would gladly close with you upon *Catholick Terms*) drop from you at unawares, when you scarce think of them, what an excellent Advocate should they



they have of you, if indeed you was minded to undertake their Cause? Yet how contrary hereunto are you, in your too partial Account, p. 305. where your Gentleman pinching you with this Question, *Can it be proved that Christ hath invested the Guides of this Church — with a power to make Laws and Decrees, prescribing not only things necessary for common Order and Decency, but new federal Rites, and teaching Signs and Symbols, &c.* I answer, (say you) 'that such a Church hath power to appoint Rules of Order and Decency 'not repugnant to the Word (which whether this be to the purpose of new federal Rites, and teaching Signs and Symbols, will I suppose be further examined) which on that account others are bound to submit to; and to take such care of its preservation, as to admit none to its Priviledges, but such as do submit to them; (Here you are quite off from your Catholick Terms again, and for limiting and inclosing the Catholick Church) and if any disturb the Peace of this Church (and here you do not clear the most peaceable Dissenters, that only meet for the Worship of God, and separate no farther from your Church, than as it is not Catholick: you go on) The Civil Magistrate may justly inflict Civil Penalties upon them for it. Is this your Mind, that all that submit not to those new federal Rites (as they are supposed) and teaching Signs and Symbols (spoken of) should be both debarred of Church-Priviledges, and laid under Civil Penalties, as disturbers of the Churches Peace? Then I cannot but wish that Governours may have more Moderation and Clemency, or poor Dissenters more Faith and Patience, than you shew Christian Charity herein.

But if they are as near the Primitive Church, and as much in Communion with the Catholick Church as you are; yea, and in Communion with you still, so far as you are Catholick, what great reason can you have so severely to condemn them? I hope the Doctrine of the Non-conformists generally is sound, their Worship agreeable to the Word. The only Question then remaining seems to be; By what Authority they do these things? And who gave them Authority? Now it is true, they cannot pretend Authority from the Bishops: but if they can prove, they have Authority from Christ, is not that sufficient? If he hath called them to the work of the Ministry, and commandeth them to be diligent and faithful in it (according to their Abilities and Opportunities) methinks Men should not deny their Authority. And whether may not such Societies as you call new Churches, return what you cite (p. 179, 180.) out of Calvin (Instit. l. 4. c. 1. n. 9.) as proving them to be true Churches, They having the Word of God truly preached, and Sacraments administered according to Christ's Institution? Now he saith (as you have him) where ever these Marks are to be found in particular Societies, those are true Churches, howsoever they are distributed according to Humane Conveniences. And therefore if you did not look only on one side, you might probably see, that you are no more allowed wilfully to separate from them, than they are from you.

And



And as that Synod of the Reformed Churches in France, at Charenton, A. D. 1631. declared (as you have it p. 186.) *That there was no Idolatry, or Superstition in the Lutheran Churches; and therefore the Members of their Churches might be received into Communion with them, without renouncing their own Opinions or Practices:* So why might not the Non-conformists, and their Hearers be taken into, or acknowledged in Communion with the Church of England, without renouncing their Opinions or Practices, they being certainly as far from Idolatry or Superstition, as any of the Lutheran Churches. As the Helvetian Churches (with you, p. 187) declare; *That no Separation ought to be made for different Rites and Ceremonies, where there is an Agreement in Doctrine: and the true Concord of Churches lies in the Doctrine of Christ, and the Sacraments delivered by him:* Even so because the Non-Conformists consent with you in Doctrine, do not break them off from your Communion, for their difference about Ceremonies.

May not several Churches differ in Modes and Forms of Worship, and yet have Communion with one another? Some Difference you cannot but grant betwixt your Cathedral Service, and that in common Country Churches. p. 146, 147. You will not say, the Churches in other Nations, that have not the same Rule with you, are *Schismatics*. No, not though such came over into England, and lived among you. And what if the old Liturgy, and that new one (which you cannot but remember the compiling of, and presenting to the Bishops, at the Savoy 1661.) had both passed, and been allowed, for Ministers to use, as they judged most convenient, might not several Ministers and Congregations in this case have used different Modes of Worship, without Breach of the Churches Peace, or counting each other *Schismatics*? Would you have called those, *new separate Churches*, that made use of the *new reformed Liturgy*? And what if a *Dutch Church* was in your Parish? Would you disclaim Communion with them, because they had some Rules and Orders different from yours? And what if divers of your Parish, living near it, should joyn with that Congregation, would you thence conclude, that they erected a *new separate Church*? And, as the Canon 1640. speaks of *bowing towards the East or Altar*, *That they which use this Rite should not despise them which use it not*, &c. if now our King and Parliament (like true Catholick Moderators) should put forth an *Henoticum*, make an healing Law, enjoining Conformists and Non-conformists, that agree in the same Faith and Worship for Substance, to attend peaceably on their Ministry, and serve God and his Church the best they can, whether they use the Liturgy and Ceremonies, or no, without uncharitable Censures, and bitter Reflections upon one another, either in Word, or Writing; would you yet say, that the Non-conformists Assemblies (not following your Rules and Orders) were no other than *new separate Churches*?

(5.) I know no *Laws*, nor *Ecclesiastical Canons*, that the present *Non-conformists* have made. And *non-entis nulla sunt predicata*. But if your meaning be, that it is enough to prove them *New Churches*, that they come not up to your *Laws*, and *Church-Rules*, and therefore are so far different from you, as they conform not to you, I would argue thus:

Either *Conformity in all things* to your *Church-Rules* is necessary to Communion with the Church of *England*, and to cut off the charge of being of a *New Church*, or not.

If *Conformity in all things* be not necessary here, why may not sober Dissenters, that own the Church of *England* for a true Church, and profess the same Faith, and worship God in no other manner, than according to the *Liturgy and Practice of the Church of England*, ( as you say, p. 160. Mr. B. declared in writing, and as I told you a good Lawyer pleadeth, *Rector of Sutton*, p. 26, & 50. ) I say, why may not such be owned as in Communion with the Church of *England*? Why do you charge them with erecting new separate Churches, meerly because they differ from you in some alterable Circumstances, and separable Accidents, not necessary to Churches Concord and Communion? I see, you dare not say, that those things wherein they differ from you are any *parts of Worship*; So they are of the same Faith, and agree with you in all *parts of Worship*. And is not all this ( with their owning themselves to be of the Church of *England*, so far as it is *Catholick* ) a bidding fair for your Reception of them, and acknowledging them still in Communion with you? And then why have you so many words of such being *no good Christians*, because *Members of no Church*? ( as pag. 104, 105, 110. f. ) If *Conformity in all things* to your *Church-Rules* be not necessary, pray tell us what is necessary, and what not: what things may be dispensed with, and what not. *Rector of Sutton*, p. 27. n. 9. You were put in mind of it to inquire, whether there be not some in publick Place, ( not very well satisfied with what they have done ) who come not up to your *Church-Rules*? As, some read not all the *Comm-Prayer* they are enjoyned to read, and yet had declared their *Assent and Consent* to the use ( at least ) as you would have it. Some use not the *Surplice*, some omit the *Cross* in Baptism; some dare not put away from the Sacrament any, meerly for *not kneeling*. And yet you charge not such with Schism, ( pag. 148. n. 5. ) yet have they different Rules, or at least, they differ from your Rules, as well as *Non-conformists*. And I know not whether you may not be understood to allow Men to go from their Parish Church ( pag. 145. n. 1. ) provided they elsewhere joyn with your Churches, as Members of them. What then is the *parting-Point* from the Communion of your Church, or the *trying* Point

*Point of Conformity, without which a New Church is erected?* Here I offer this Note upon what you say farther, pag. 148. n. 5. That many whom you condemn, though not satisfied with such and such Orders of the Church, yet continue in all Acts of Communion with your Church, ( or in all that you will call *parts of Worship* ) and draw not others from it, upon any meer Pretence, no, not at all; though they dare not but joyn at other times with *Non-conformists*, in that which they are well assured is as truly God's Worship, and if they say, in some Respects more pure, you have not yet disproved it. And therefore you should *make good your word* there, and not charge such with Schism.

Or if you should say, *Conformity in all things* to your Church-Rules is necessary, that if Men differ never so little from those Rules, it is to erect *new Churches*, what woful rending work would this make? By a Parity of Reason, may not other foreign Churches be denied to have Communion with the Church of England? How many that could not submit to these Laws and Rules, without receding from their own *publick Confessions*? Could the French, and Belgick Churches assent to the *Jus divinum* of Episcopacy? could they own it, as evident to all Men diligently reading the *holy Scriptures*, to be of Apostolical Institution? And would not any one that reads the *Declaration of the Faith and Ceremonies of the Psaltzgraves Churches*, printed at London A. D. 1637, take them to have been averse from such Conformity, as the Church of England stands upon? You glory in the good Opinion of the Reformed Churches, and Protestant Divines abroad, concerning the Constitution and Orders of our Church: and their owning Communion with our Church, ( pag. 96, 97. ) And you make nothing of what hath been returned by way of Answer to Dr. D. Bonasus Vapulans is but a little Creature ( I confess, to look on ) yet some that have read it, do not look on it as nothing. But if an owning of the Divine, or Apostolical Right of Episcopacy, and Re-ordination, &c. be made the Terms of their Communion with our Church, how many Protestant Divines abroad, that would renounce Communion with us, rather than be pleased with it upon such Terms?

And further, if *Conformity in all things* to your Church-Rules be necessary, &c. How many Parochial Ministers and Congregations ( as was noted before ) must be denied to be in Communion with the Church of England, whom for the same Reason you must call *new erected Churches*? For as one says ( alluding to that ) *They who themselves were circumcised, kept not the Law.* They who have assented and consented, observe not the Orders and Rules to which they have given their Assent, &c. And yet ( as you have it from another ) *The Priests in the Temple break the Law, and are blameless.* Then must you not either acquit many Dissenters here, or condemn many Conformists?



You see how fain I would have Protestant Dissenters acknowledged still to have Communion with the Church of *England*, (if it might be) the difference being not in such things as belong to it, *as a Church*. If you took away those things, which are as the *Wall of Partition* betwixt you and them, your Churches would be as sound and entire without them. And if you make them Schismatics, for differing from you in such things, while they agree with you in all things necessary; whether will you not make yourselves, or other Churches (you would be ashamed to disown) Schismatics, who differ from you in as great Matters, as such Dissenters do? Here let me press you a little further, Keep to your own Rule, *Preface p. 46.* 'As far as the Obligation to preserve the Church's Peace extends, so far doth the Sin of Schism reach. Then it follows, if the *Obligation to preserve the Church's Peace* extends so far as to the Rulers and Governours of the Church, there may be as much Schism in their setting up unnecessary Rules, which others cannot submit to, as in Mens varying from such Rules. *P. 209.* You argue, 'From the Obligation which lies upon all Christians, to preserve the Peace and Unity of the Church. And now (say you) 'I have brought the matter home to the Consciences of Men. Had you put the Matter home indifferently and *impartially* to the Consciences of Men on both sides; that is, both of *Imposers, and Dissenters*, many could not but have thought in their Consciences, you was to be commended for it. But then, had you not pleaded as much for Dissenters, as here you plead against them? I must grant, they ought (*for the Peace and Unity of the Church*) to yield as far as they can, without sinning against God, and their own Souls: and should not Imposers do the like? Were this one Rule agreed on, what Peace and Unity would soon follow? What *Chillingworth* (*p. 283. § 71.*) says of Protestants, That *they grant their Communion to all who hold with them, not all things, but things necessary, that is, such as are in Scripture plainly delivered:*] Make this good of the Church of *England*, and by my consent, all we (who have unwillingly appeared against you) will readily and joyfully give you our publick Thanks.

What you say further, *p. 209.* may thus be handed back again to you: If there be *no sufficient Reason to justify* such Rules and Orders, if they are a *Violation of the Unity of the Church*, you there make it a *Sin, as much as murder is, and as plainly forbidden.* And therefore I do earnestly desire (as you, *p. 213.*) all Parties concerned, as *they love their own Souls, and as they would avoid the Guilt of so great a Sin, impartially and without prejudice to consider that Passage of Irenæus* (with you, *p. 212.*) *That Christ will come to judge those who make Schisms in the Church, and rather regard their own Advantage, than the Church's Unity, &c.* And if any indifferent Men had the matter put to them to decide, who were more likely to *regard their own Advantage*, whether

ther some of you, or such as Mr. B. one might soon guess, what their Sentence, or Verdict would be. If I seem here, and sometimes elsewhere to digress a little; yet I think in reason you should overlook it. I would hope that in time you may be convinced of a greater Digression in the scope of your late Writings.

(6.) If you, and the Church of England, will not be so favourable towards those *distinct Societies*, that are not under your Church-Rules, as to acknowledg them in Communion with you; yet by what you, and Chillingworth say, I see not but they may be still in Communion with the *Catholick Church*, and Members of it. *Knot* talketh thus to our Reproach, (*Charity maint. part. 1. c. 5. § 38.*) *Protestants cannot avoid the note of Schism, at least by reason of their mutual Separation from one another. For most certain it is, that there is very great difference— between the Lutherans, the rigid Calvinists, and the Protestants of England.* But it is observable, what Chillingworth says, p. 255. Eighthly (to that) *That all the Members of the Catholick Church, must of necessity be united in external Communion.*] Which tho it were much to be desired it were so, yet certainly cannot be perpetually true—Divers times it hath happened, as in the case of Chrysostome and Epiphanius, that particular Men, and particular Churches, have upon an over-valued difference, either renounced Communion mutually, or one of them separated from the other, and yet both have continued Members of the *Catholick Church*. Here let us suppose some unhappy difference to arise among your selves, as if some were for the publick condemning of your *Irenicum*, some against it; some offended at those Ministers who appear not as zealous against Dissenters, as you have shewed your self, and others offended as much at you, and them; some taking offence at those that bow at the word *Jesus*, or bow towards the *Altar*, and others taking the like offence at those who scruple, or forbear such Practice. Suppose now the contention was carried so high, that the disagreeing Parties refused Communion with one another hereupon; and if it came to that, I would know which of these should be the *new Church*? Or whether both Parties might not yet be in Communion with the Church of England? And much more, may not the same *Catholick Church* hold Conformists, and Protestant Dissenters?

And you give us this Note, *Rational Account*, p. 331. 'He that separates only from particular Churches as to such things which concern not their Being, is only separated from the Communion of those Churches, and not the Catholick. Now will you say, those Rules and Orders, about which all the Difference is betwixt you, and the Non-conformists, concern the Being of your Church? I doubt you will never be able to convince many, but the Church of England might be every jot as well without them.



But if it should happen, that any Error, or Corruption is to be found therein, then you have more to say for those you here oppose, *Ibid.* and pag. 332. 'which is therefore more properly a Separation from the Errors, than the Communion of such a Church. Wherefore if we suppose that 'there is no one visible Church, whose Communion is not tainted with 'some Corruptions, though, if these Corruptions be enjoined as Conditions of Communion, I cannot communicate with any of those Churches; yet it follows not that I am separated from the external Communion of the Catholick Church, but that I only suspend Communion 'with those particular Churches, till I may safely joyn with them. Which you illustrate there by a Comparison, where you have these remarkable Words, 'And if several other Persons, be of the same mind 'with me, and we therefore joyn together; Do we therefore divide our 'selves from the whole World by only taking care of our own Safety? &c.

So *Chillingworth* speaks as like you as, if one had taken his Hints from the other, pag. 298. He is for distinguishing, not confounding these two, departing from the Church, and departing from some general Opinions and Practices, which did not constitute, but vitiate the Church. More he hath to that purpose. But that which I would specially note out of him here ( to shew the Harmony and Consent betwixt you, which otherwise should have come in before ) pag. 269. *A Man may possibly leave some Opinion, or Practice of a Church ( says he ) — and continue still a Member of that Church : provided that what he forsakes be not one of those things wherein the Essence of the Church consists. Whereas peradventure this Practice may be so involved with the external Communion of this Church, that it may be simply impossible for him to leave this Practice, and not to leave the Churches external Communion.*

I cite such Passages as these, because I would have the World know, and take notice, what Friends you are sometimes to poor Non-conformists. That if any should now send an Hue and Cry after them, as after Murderers, you are willing they should take Sanctuary either in your Church, or in the Church Catholick, the New Church, your second Conclusion speaks of, being not so safe.

Now my second Conclusion is this.

2. That many of those Societies which you condemn, do not separate from the Church of England, many of them have ordinary external Communion with you; and though in their Worship, they do not in all things follow your Church-Rules and Orders, yet their Worship cannot be proved contrary, but is agreeable to Scripture-Rule. And as for those, who are not satisfied to go so far, as to hold external Communion with you, yet having Communion with you in the same Faith, it were a very desirable



desirable thing, that the *Bars to their full Communion* with you were removed (if they be such things as are not necessary.) And in the mean time (possibly) those *New Churches* are better than *no Churches*.

And indeed it is matter of wonder to me, if you have no more Charity for such, have no better Thoughts of them, than of those *idle, loose, profane Persons*, that wholly neglect and contemn the Worship of God, *that never go to any Church at all*.

I would say more to this, did I not think enough is said already.

Now I come to your *last Conclusion*.

3. 'As to things in the Judgment of the Primitive and Reformed Churches left undetermined by the Law of God, and in matters of meer Order and Decency, and wholly as to Form and Government, every one, notwithstanding what his private Judgment may be of them, is bound for the Peace of the Church of God, to submit to the Determination of the lawful Governours of the Church.'

But would you not lead us here into a Maze, a *Labyrinth*, without any Clew to guide us out? Let us now see how *Pertinent and Material* this is to your purpose.

Here first, I must suppose this *Question*, viz. How far, or in what things is every Man bound (whatever his private Judgment be) for the Churches Peace, to submit to the Determination of the lawful Governours of the Church?

And your Answer is, every one is bound to submit to the Determination of such (what ever his private Judgment be.)

1. As to things in the Judgment of the Primitive and Reformed Churches left undetermin'd by the Law of God.

2. And in matters of meer Order and Decency.

3. And wholly as to the Form of Government; This I think, you cannot deny to be the true *Analysis* of your third Conclusion.

How *pertinent* this your Resolution is to the case of Dissenters, and how *material* to give them Satisfaction, will appear by examining the several Parts.

But first, it is worth nothing, that you speak only of the *Determination of the lawful Governours of the Church*. Implying, that Men are not bound to submit to the Determination of such as may be proved *Usurpers*, such as are not *lawful Governours* of the Church. Then so far you and they may be agreed, that if the Pope should set up a *Patriarch, &c.* in England, Men were not bound to submit to their Determination, till such could be proved *lawful Governours* of the Church. And then whether you have fully answered your *Gentleman* (p. 305.) and others, and proved that *Christ hath invested with Power to make such Decrees and Determinations* (as lawful Governours of the Church) *those who never were chosen, or approved by the People*, is another Question? But

But then where lawful Governours of the Church determine, you tell us; (1.) Every one is bound to submit to their Determination, *As to things in the Judgment of the Primitive and Reformed Churches left undetermin'd by the Law of God.*

Here 1. You should have told us, whether by the *Primitive Churches* you meant the *primo-primitive Churches*, or only such *Ancient Churches*, as those of the fourth, or fifth Age. One would guess that these latter are your *Primitive Churches*. Now in my Thoughts *King James* was quite beyond the Cardinal, and got the upper Ground, ( *In Defence of the Right of Kings*, p. 398. ) where the Cardinal arguing, that *a Doctrine believed and practised in the Church, in the continuall Current of the last Eleven Hundred Years, was not to be condemned.* ] His Majesty replied; *In these VVords he maketh a secret Confession, that in the first five hundred Years, the same Doctrine was neither apprehended by Faith, nor approved by Practice. VVherein to my understanding, the Lord Cardinal voluntarily giveth over the Suit; for the Church in the time of the Apostles, their Disciples, — was no more ignorant what Authority the Church is to challenge, — than at any time since in any succeeding Age, in which as Pride hath still flow'd to the height of a full Sea, so Purity of Religion and Manners hath kept for the most part at a low VVater-mark.*

You should have told us also what *Reformed Churches* you meant, whether all, or only some of them? And if but some, whether those that only took the Scripture, as their Rule in reforming; or those that took in the Example and Practice of some of those *Ancient Churches*, together with it?

2. What are those things, that in the Judgment of the *Primitive and Reformed Churches* are left undetermin'd by the Law of God; besides matters of meer Order and Decency, and what relates to Form of Government?

3. Can this be a safe and sure Rule? When you grant the Church may err, and general Councils may err; may they not then judg some things left undetermin'd by the Word, that are not so left? *Chillingworth* grants, there may be just and necessary Cause to depart from some Opinions and Practices of the *Catholick Church* ( p. 298. ) And you say partly the same in your *Rational Account* ( pag. 331, 332. ) Those Errors in practice, in the Judgment of the Church, may be such things as are left undetermined by the Word, when yet others are not bound to submit to them. You tell us, *Rational Account*, p. 627. *The matter to be enquired here is, what Liberty of Prescription is allowed by vertue of the Law of Christ; for since he hath made Laws to govern his Church by, it is most senseless pleading Prescription, till you have particularly examined, how far such Prescription is allowed by him.* So then it is not enough to say, in the Judgment of the *Primitive and Reformed*

Reformed Churches such things are left undetermined by God's Law, and the Church hath Power to determine them. But Men are to examine whether such Liberty be allowed by Christ. And as you go on, p. 628.

'It may be you will tell me, that in this Case, Prescription interprets Law, and that the Churches Possession argues it was the Will of Christ. But still the Proof lies upon your side, since you run your self into new Briars; for you must prove that there is no way to interpret this Law, but by the Practice ( here I must say by the *Judgment* ) of the Church, and which is the *Πατριων Πρεσβυτερων* of all, that the Church cannot come into the Possession of any thing, but what was originally given her by the *Legislator*.— He that undertakes to prove it impossible that the Church should claim by an undue Title; must prove it impossible, that the Church should ever be deceived.

4. Is this a *plain*, or rather is it not an *Impossible Rule*? If every one be bound to submit to the Determination of those things, that in the *Judgment of the Primitive and Reformed Churches* are left undetermined by the Word; then every one should be bound to know the Judgment of the *Primitive, and Reformed Churches*, as to those things. We should think it well, if Men would be perswaded to *search the Scriptures*; and to submit to what God hath revealed and made known there to be their Duty; but ( according to what you have here laid down ) this should not be sufficient: but every one is also bound to *search the Monuments of Antiquity*, to turn over the *Antient Fathers and Councils*, and so likewise to get a View of the whole Body of latter *Confessions*, that may inform him of the Judgment of the *Primitive and Reformed Churches*. And is not this to *bind heavy Burthens upon Men's Shoulders*, and to make more Sins than are found to be so in God's Law? Or will you say, that Men are bound to an *Implicite Faith* here, that what you assert to have been the Judgment of the *Primitive and Reformed Churches*, they must believe without more adoe? Or if you will not say they are bound to such an *Implicite Faith* in your Word, will you allow them to *suspend the Act of Submission*, to the Determination of Church-Governours, till such time as they can be satisfied, that such Determination is agreeable to the *Judgment of the Primitive, and Reformed Churches*? Will you give them time, till they can find *Re-ordination* in the like Case, reading of *Apocrypha* in the room of God's Word, &c. to have been approved and practised in the *Primitive and Reformed Churches*?

5. Is this a *golden*, rather is it not a *leaden Rule*? May it not be turned contrary ways? Was the *Primitive Church* for *kneeling* in the Act of receiving? Were not the *Psaltzgraves Churches* to be reckoned among the *reformed Churches*? And were they for our *English Ceremonies*? Do not the *Lutheran*,



ran Churches hold some things lawful, and indifferent, which in the Judgment of the Church of *England* are unwarrantable? As things indifferent, and lawful in the Judgment of the Church of *England*, are not so in the Judgment of some other reformed Churches. I do profess plainly (says *Chillingworth*, p. 376.) that I cannot find any rest for the Sole of my Foot, but upon this Rock only (the Bible.) I see plainly and with mine own Eyes, that there are Popes against Popes, Councils against Councils, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against themselves, a consent of Fathers of one Age against a consent of Fathers of another Age, the Church of one Age against the Church of another Age.

6. Is this Rule, of the Judgment of the Primitive and Reformed Churches indeed applicable to your established Rule? Do you find the one agreeable to the other? Were the Primitive Churches for imposing the same Liturgy, the same Rites and Ceremonies, which they yet held undetermined by God's Word? Was it their Judgment, that each Nation, or Province should be tied up to a strict Uniformity in such things? Do you find this within the first five hundred years? Can you gainsay those Words of yours, (cited, *Rector of Sutton*, p. 19. which I think are pertinent and material here) 'We see the Primitive Christians did not make so much of any Uniformity in Rites and Ceremonies; nay I scarce think any Churches in the Primitive times can be produced, that did exactly in all things observe the same Customs; which might be an Argument of Moderation in all, as to these things, but especially in pretended admirers of the Primitive Church. And yet would you have every one bound to submit to the determination of Church-Governors in such Matters, whatever his private Judgment be concerning them? As *Eusebius* notes from *Irenæus* (l. 5. c. 26. *English* c. 23.) the Primitive Christians could differ in such Matters, and yet live in Peace. And (ἐκ διαφωνίας τῆς νεότητος τὴν ὁμόνοιαν τῆς πρεσβυτερίας συνέτισται.) So *Anicetus* and *Polycarpus* could differ in such Matters, and yet communicate one with another. The Primitive Christians retained contrary Observations, and yet (as *Irenæus* said) held fast the bond of Love and Unity. Can you ever prove that the Primitive Church, or the best reformed Churches, have assumed a Power of suspending Ministers from their Office, and of debarring Christians from Communion for such Matters?

Here comes to my Mind that which you say, *Unreas. of Separat.* p. 14. that our Reformers proceeded more out of reverence to the Ancient Church, than meer opposition to Popery. (Yet with *King James*, *Defence of the right of Kings*, p. 470. the Christian Religion reformed, is as to say, purged and cleansed of all Popish Dreags.) And p. 17. 'Altho they made the Scripture the only Rule of Faith, and rejected all things repugnant thereto; yet they designed not to make a Transformation of a Church, but a Reformation of it; by reducing

‘reducing it, as near as they could, to that state it was in under the first Christian Emperors, &c. (Agreeable to *Chillingworth*, p. 287. § 82.) But whether you took not the hint of distinguishing the Transformation of a Church from the Reformation of it, from Arch-Bishop *Whitgift*, I cannot tell. However *T. C.* (latter part of his *second Reply*, p. 172.) could not discern it to have any Solidity, but called it a *single solid Argument*: seeing Transforming may be in part, as well as Reforming. And you have not improved it at all. But what a strange Assertion is that of yours, p. 96. ‘That there are in effect no new Terms of Communion with this Church, but the same which our first Reformers owned, and suffered Martyrdom for in Queen Mary’s Days? And will you stand to this, that they died Martyrs for Ceremonies, and for such Impositions, as have thrust out so many Ministers, that are most ready to subscribe to the same Truth, for which indeed they laid down their Lives? I had thought, that *J. Rogers* (the *Proto-Martyr* in that Persecution) had been a *Non-conformist*. As there were other *Non-conformists* also that suffered. And can you make the World believe, that they suffered for Conformity? And did not the Martyrs in Queen Mary’s Days suffer in one and the same Cause, whether Conformists, or Non-conformists? Indeed they agreed well in *Red* (in Blood, and Flames) who before had differed in *Black* and *White*. But as you will have it, p. 2. ‘Our Church stands on the same Grounds, &c. And p. 4. ‘I would only know, if those Terms of Communion which were imposed by the Martyrs, and other Reformers, and which are only continued by us, &c. I say, you would persuade us, that you are upon the same Grounds with our first Reformers, who were for Reforming according to the Scripture, rejecting all things repugnant thereto, only they would have the Church reduced, as near as they could, to that state it was in, under the first Christian Emperors, (p. 17.) Now to make this good it lieth on you to prove from Catholic written Tradition, that the present established Rule was the Rule for Admission of Ministers into their Function, and other Church-Members into Communion, observed in those Antient Churches, or one as near as could be to it; and further to make it good, that it is not at all repugnant to the Scripture-Rule: Or if you cannot do this, you must then grant, that you are gone off from the Rule of our first Reformers, that is, the Scripture, and those Primitive Churches, and that the Terms of Communion are not indeed the same. *Propter externos ritus disciplina homines pios ferire, neque Domini est voluntas, neque purioris Ecclesie mos.*

7. Would not such a Rule be point-blank contrary to Scripture-Rule? If never so many Councils, if all the Churches upon Earth determined, that they had such Power, that they could cut off both Ministers and Members of the Church for Matters left undetermined by God’s Law, we could not sub-



mit to such Determination, while we believe the Scripture, which tells us so plainly, that they have no Power for Destruction, but for Edification. I subscribe to that of Panormitan, *Magis Laico esse credendum, si ex scripturis loquatur, quam Papæ, si absque verbo Dei agat.* Is not the Scripture-Rule plain here, 1 Pet. 5. 3. that the Governours of the Church must not Lord it over God's Heritage? And tho the Laity, or common Christian People are directly and properly intended there; yet no doubt, by just and undeniable Consequence it will as well follow, that they are not to Lord it over the Clergy. And when Peter Martyr sets down the just causes of separation from Rome, he gives this for one good Reason; *Because they usurp more Power than the Apostle Paul accounted belonging to him.* 2 Cor. 1. *Not as if we had Dominion over your Faith.* *Quibus verbis testatur fidem nemini subjectam esse, nisi verbo Dei.* And then it would be seriously enquired, whether to require Assent and Consent to another Book besides the Bible, a Book in Folio, and to all things contained in it, be not to have Dominion over Mens Faith? Many are in doubt here, whose doubts you have not (so far as I can perceive) yet resolved. You your self must grant, that the Churches of God have, or should have no such Custom, to tyrannize over the Faith and Consciences of Men (that is Lording it indeed.) As here *Unreas. of Separat.* p. 184. You cite M. Claude, allowing, or maintaining Tyranny over Mens Consciences to be a justifiable Reason of Separation. And *Le Blanc*, p. 185. And the Confession of *Strasburg*, p. 188. That they look on no human Traditions as condemned in Scripture, but such as are repugnant to the Law of God, and bind the Consciences of Men. And *Joh. Crocius* (*ib.*) Ceremonies forbidden break the Churches Unity; yet its Communion is not to be forsaken for one or two of these, if there be no Tyranny over the Consciences of Men. And *Bishop Davenant*, p. 189, 190. Who grants that Tyranny over Mens Faith and Consciences would be a sufficient Reason to hinder Communion. As he says (*Sentent. D. Dav.* p. 6.) If some one Church will so have Dominion over the Faith of others, that she acknowledgeth none for Brethren, or admits none into Communion with her, *nisi credendi ac loquendi legem ab eadem prius accipiant* — the Holy Scripture forbids us thus to make our selves the Slaves of any Mortals whosoever they are: our one only Master (Christ) forbids — *Quæ hæc lege in Communionem alterius Ecclesiæ recipitur, non pacem inde acquirit, sed iniquissima servitutis pactionem.* Here I set down a little more than you cite; as indeed it was not for your purpose. To these you agree, P. 221. 'Not but that I think there may be a Separation without Sin, from a Society retaining the Essentials of a Church: but then I say, the Reason of such Separation is, some heinous Error in Doctrine, or some idolatrous Practice in Worship, or some Tyranny over the Consciences of Men; &c. This Tyranny over Conscience with you, is an imposing of unlawful things. Which I infer from



from those Words, p. 208. *A prudent and due submission in lawful things lies between Tyranny over Mens Consciences, and endless Separation.* With Bishop Davenant it is *credendi ac loquendi legem disere.* Now if this be the Case of Non-conformist Ministers, that others would tyrannize over their Consciences, will it not justify their Separation, which is but a *Separation secundum quid*? And if you deny this to be their Case, be pleased to give a sound and solid Answer to those few Pages of the *second Plea for Peace*, towards the end, p. 116, &c. *Qui tyrannidem in Christianissimum vel usurpat, vel inuehit, ille Christum, quantum potest, e solio dejicit, &c.* Amyrald. in *Thef. Salmur*, p. 435. § 22.

8. Will you say, every Man is bound (for Peace-sake) to submit to the Determination of Church-Governours, *whatever his private Judgment may be*. When his Judgment may be, that such a Determination is against the Word, tho never so many Churches, and Councils judg otherwise? And when his Judgment may be, that *submission* to such Determination of Men, would be *real Disobedience* and acting contrary to the Will of God? If his Conscience be rightly informed, then he *opposeth the Authority of Scripture*, and the *Judgment of God to the Judgment of Men* (as Chillingworth says, p. 309.) which is certainly allowable. If his Conscience and Judgment be erroneous, yet he must *suspend the act of Submission* to such Determination, till he can be better informed: or acting here *against his Judgment* and Conscience (tho erroneous) he would greatly sin. As suppose the Governours of the Church to have determined, that we shall all *declare our Assent* unto that in *Preface* before the *Book of Ordination*, [*That it is evident unto all Men, diligently reading Holy Scripture, and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles time, there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons, as several Officers.*] You could not have submitted to such Determination, while your Judgment was the same, as when you wrote your *Irenicum*. This is evident from what I noted thence, *Rector of Sutton*, p. 41, 66. '*Nothing can be more evident, than that it rose not from any divine Institution, &c.* Could you have dissembled with God and Man for Peace-sake. (But more of this afterwards.)

But I am thinking, you may possibly object, That you speak of things supposed to be left undetermin'd, whereas I Instance here, in a matter that the Word determines. Yet I hope this may be more convincing. Let us for this once suppose, that you could now prove from Scripture, that the *Bishops Office* is distinct from that of *Presbyters*; yet I hope you will grant me, that you could not have submitted to such Determination of the Church, while you believed no such thing. And then I have what I would have. Every Man cannot lawfully submit to the Churches Determination, though it be according to the Scripture (that is, so long as

his Judgment, is the Determination is without, and against Scripture ) then must not the same be said, of such Determination, as is *besides the Scripture* ? I know you will not say, the *Churches Word is above God's*. So you see how this part of your Rule falls short of what you aim at.

One thing you have under this Rule, *Irenic. p. 124.* I should take a little notice of some-where, and let me do it here. ' There must be a Difference made ( say you ) between the Liberty and Freedom of a Man's own Judgment, and the Authority of it. So by being under Governours a Man parts with the *Authority of his Judgment*; but you would not have him deprived of the *Liberty and Freedom of his Judgment*; otherwise to what purpose is this distinction brought ? Now I would not be so uncharitable, as to think, that by the *Liberty of a Mans own Judgment* you could mean a Liberty of professing and declaring contrary to his own Judgment, in Submission to the Determination of Church-Governours, for the Churches Peace. And therefore I say, your Rule here is short, and reacheth not to our Case.

2. You say, in this last Conclusion, that in *Matters of meer Order and Decency*, every one for the Churches Peace is bound to submit to the Determination of the lawful Governours of the Church.

Here, 1. This is readily granted, if by *Matters of meer Order and Decency*, you understand *Matters of meer Order and Decency*. As you seemed to understand no more, when you wrote your *Iren.* For there you distinguish betwixt ' Ceremonies and Matters of meer Decency and Order for Order-sake. And you further say that Matters of Order and Decency are ' allowable and fitting; but Ceremonies, properly taken for Actions significative, their Lawfulness may with better Ground be scrupled. (Noted, *Rector of Sutton*, pag. 16.) And thus far ( if you please ) you and I are agreed, That *Rules of Order* ( not contrary to the end of Order ) should be submitted unto; and that not only for the Churches Peace, but also in Obedience to God's Command, *Let all things be done decently and in order.* And to such orderly Determinations, what *Camero* says ( pag. 314. col. 1. ) may in some sort be applied, — *Admonitiones quidem sunt respectu Ecclesiae, at Leges respectu Dei; nempe hac Ratione quod commendavit Ecclesiae, Deus imperavit.*

2. But I observe, that in other Writings since your mind is changed, and you have learned now to confound, what before you would have distinguished, that is, your *Rites and Ceremonies*, and *Matters of Order and Decency* ( as was noted, *Rector of Sutton*, pl 63. ) So you say, in your *New Account*, or *Unreasonableness of Separation*, pp. 393. ' We declare, that they ' are appointed only for Order and Decency. And thus now these become *meer Matters of Order and Decency* with you. Of which there hath been, and is so great dispute.

Here



Here two or three Questions come in for your Solution.

1. Whether such Rites and Ceremonies, are Matters of meer Order and Decency?

2. Whether the Governours of the Church have Power to appoint and determine the use of such Matters?

3. Whether every one is bound to submit to them, upon such Determination?

I intend not to say much upon these Questions, supposing they may fall in others Way. And but that you seem too resolved to *hold your own Conclusion*, so much hath been written upon these Points, that might excuse us from saying more, till what hath been published, be fairly answered.

*Question 1. Whether such Rites and Ceremonies are Matters of meer Order and Decency?*

1. You say, and *declare, they are appointed only for Order and Decency.* But not as if the contrary implied a natural Indecency (as was noted, *Reſtor of Sutton*, p. 63.) whereupon it follows, that you must hold them *vainly appointed*; or that the contrary might as well have been appointed; and so teach, or tempt People to have hard Thoughts of the Governours of the Church, for appointing and so rigorously imposing such Ceremonies, whereby many are deprived of their Ministers, and of some of God's Ordinances; which may seem very harsh, if they are only for Order and Decency, and that in so low a Degree, that the Worship of God might be *as orderly and decently* performed, without them. Would you have the Governours of the Church deprive Ministers of their Liberty, and others of the Sacraments for no other Cause, than their meer Wills?

2. Do you well accord here, with Mr. R. Hooker, who says, *Our Lord himself did that which Custom and long-usage had made fit; we, that which Fitness and great Decency hath made usual?* You seemed, (*Answer to several Treatises*, p. 268.) unwilling that any should urge you with that, *Scil.* Then the Apostle's way of Worship, was not not in it self altogether so decent and fit. But if the Ceremonies be in themselves of such an *indifferent Nature*, that the contrary implieth no *Indecency*, then you cannot say, that their *great Decency and Fitness* was the Ground of appointing and using them. Wherein you and Mr. Hooker, appear to be of different Minds. And *kneeling at Communions* with him (*l. 5. c. 68. p. 366.*) is a *Gesture of Piety*, which is something more than *meer Decency*.

3. Do you well accord here with the Governours of the Church? You *declare, our Ceremonies are appointed only for Order and Decency.* Whereas they have *declared* them to be for the *due Reverence* of Christ's holy Mysteries  
and



*and Sacraments. And that they are apt to stir up the dull mind of Man to the Remembrance of his Duty to God, by some notable and special Signification, whereby he might be edified. Will you say such things, are only for Order and Decency, which are for the due Reverence of Christ's holy Mysteries, and for stirring up the dull mind of Man to the Remembrance of his Duty to God, and for his Edification? One would think, that such things should be good in themselves, and not as you say, of an indifferent Nature in themselves. Can you imagine things that are only for Order and Decency (whose contrary are as decent) to be the same, or as good as things for the due Reverence of Christ's holy Mysteries? &c. And if a Ceremony be apt to stir up the dull mind of Man to the Remembrance of his Duty, whereby he may be edified, then is it not made medium excitans, which you say (Unreasonableness of Separation, p. 354.) our Church utterly denies? Is here no spiritual Effect attributed to Ceremonies, which you can by no means allow, pag. 347. But this you are commonly driven to in Disputation, to say, they are only Matters of Order and Decency, and so would bring them under that Rule or Precept, *Let all things be done decently and in Order,*] tho they are things of a quite different Nature. Matters of Order and Decency are there commanded in genere; but it would be no Transgression of that Command, though not one of these Ceremonies were appointed, or used in the Worship of God, nor any others like them.*

*Quest. 2. Whether the Governours of the Church have Power to appoint and determine the Use of such Ceremonies?*

Here 1. You say, pag. 347. 'If Men do assert so great a Power in the Church, as to appoint things for spiritual Effects, — it is all one as to say, the Church may make new parts of Worship. And then the Question is, whether these are no spiritual Effects, if they be for the due Reverence of Christ's holy Mysteries, and for Men's Edification? And as Dr. Field says, they are adhibited, to exercise great Fervour and Devotion. And Hooker, Men are edified by Ceremonies when either their Understandings are taught somewhat whereof in such Actions it behooveth all Men to consider, or when their minds are stirred up to that Reverence, Devotion, and due Regard which in those Cases seemeth requisite. If you make them unprofitable, idle Indifferents, are not such things unworthy of the Churches Appointment? and if others make them profitable, edifying Ceremonies, have you not here denied that the Church hath so great Power of her self to appoint such?

2. If Church-Governours have Power, that is, lawful Power, or Authority from Christ, to appoint and command the Use of such Ceremonies, then they can shew so much Power granted them in their Commission, or  
prove

prove it from the written Law of Christ. Here I remember what you say, *Rational Account*, p. 103. 'Is it in that Place, where he bids the Apostles to teach all that he commanded them, that he gives Power to the Church to teach more than he commanded? And a little before it, what hath he commanded her to do? to add to his Doctrine by making things necessary, which he never made to be so? Surely, you cannot think the Church hath any such Power. In all kind of Grants, says Gurney (Vind. of 2d Cor. 45.) *The want of an Affirmative is Negative sufficient.* Then may not Men question, whether the Governours of the Church have such a Power from Christ; till they can prove it?

If [ *Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you* ] doth not imply, that the Governours of the Church may teach and command more, than they have his Word and Warrant for; I can think of no other Text more likely for the purpose, than that, 1 Cor. 14. 40. *Let all things be done decently and in Order* ] Upon which Mr. F. Mason grounded [ *The Authority of the Church in making Canons and Constitutions concerning things indifferent*, printed 1607. ] But here you will fall short too. For ( I suppose ) the Jews were as well bound to perform the Worship of God *decently and in order*; yet that was no Warrant or Allowance for their bringing in *other Rites and Ceremonies* into God's Worship, than what God himself had appointed. And what if Church-Governours forbid the Use of such Ceremonies? Would it be to sin against this Rule? Cannot the Worship of God be performed *decently, and in order* without them? *Antecedently* to any Determination of Christ's Governours Men are bound to worship God *decently and in Order*; but none are so bound to use such Ceremonies in God's Worship, as was hinted before. And that these differ *toto genere* from *Matters of Order and Decency*, may appear, in that if we suppose them approved of God, they are Matters of an higher Nature, than things *meerly decent*, that is, they are *pious and religious*, not only *finally*, but *formally*, that a Man would do amiss, that used them only as *decent*, neglecting the *spiritual Signification* of them. And then will it not follow, that if they be not approved and allowed of God, it is worse for Governours to appoint and command them, than if they commanded some simple *indecent thing* in God's Worship? As Superstition, or false Worship ( *ceteris paribus* ) is worse than a meer Indecency.

3. It would seem, by what we read, *Gal. 2. 11, 14.* that the Apostle Peter had no Authority to appoint the Observation of such things. Yet his Power was as great, as any Church-Governours now can pretend to, with Reason.

4. If Church-Governours have such a Power ( as you say of Men's separating upon account of their Scruples, *Unreason. of Separation*, pag. 379. which



which I answered before, pag. 29. ) *where can you stop them from appointing new Ceremonies? And where will you fix, as to the use of them? And what Assurance can you give us, that we shall see an End of them, that they will never appoint more? Notwithstanding what you say, p. 388. by the same Power that the Church hath decreed these, she may decree more Rites and Ceremonies, as indifferent as these, and how many, who can tell? And being once decreed, you must think you are bound to submit to such Determination, who are to be Judges, whether such or such Ceremonies be rightly determined and appointed? You well know what was said, Commiss. Account, p. 71. Not Inferiours, but Superiours must judg what is convenient and decent. So, if the Governours of the Church once judg all those Ancient Rites of the Christian Church, we ever read of, with many new ones of the Church of Rome, ( as many as they could refine and purge from Popish Superstition ) to be all decent, and convenient, then must you not submit to them all? Though it would be a Sign, that Religion was far past the Meridian in the Church ( as T. Fuller says ) where she can hardly be seen, for the length of her own Shadow. As you plainly declare, from another p. 184. that Separation is not warranted upon the Account of bare Ceremonies, although many more were enjoined; so you must say, that Submission to them is a thing not to be denied, though many more were appointed. And therefore I say, suppose and grant, that the Governours of the Church have Power to appoint such Ceremonies, and you know not where they and you shall stop. And this Power you grant in your subscribing to the 39 Articles. For Art. 20. saith, The Church hath Power to decree Rites or Ceremonies ( without limiting any Number. ) Tho this Clause was not extant in the Articles of Edw. 6, and Q. Elizabeth.*

Here now I fall upon those two Reasons you give ( *Unreas. of Separation, p. 16, 17.* ) for the *appointing of these Ceremonies.*

1. ' Out of a due Reverence to Antiquity, — Therefore they retained these few Ceremonies as Badges of the Respect they bore to the Ancient Church. ( And yet you cannot deny, but other Ceremonies more Ancient than some of these are laid aside; and the most Ancient of these, is so in use with you, as it was not used at first; and was so in use in the Ancient Church as it is not in use with you. Such is your Respect and Reverence here to the Ancient Church. )

2. ' To manifest the Justice and Equity of the Reformation, by letting their Enemies ( the Papists ) see they did not break Communion with them for meer indifferent Things. ( As you have it before, p. 14. ) Our Bishops proceeded ( in our Reformation ) more out of Reverence to the Ancient Church, than meer Opposition to Popery. Now I would be satisfied, whether it might not shew more Respect and Reverence to Antiquity,

if more Ceremonies were retained, and the more *Ancient*, rather than such as came up in latter times, (as *Standing* may be proved before the Ceremony of *Kneeling*?)

And whether there are not *many Ceremonies* in use among the *Papists*, capable of having a good signification put upon them, and so as *innocent* and indifferent as these; and therefore for the Reason you have given, to be retained, or entertained amongst us, to *shew our Justice and Equity* towards them, that we *proceed not in meer opposition to Popery*, that we *break not with them about meer indifferent things*? And will you be for that *peaceable Design*, for going as near to Rome as you can, without Sin? But thus upon your Principles, the Church might be *Reformed* I will not call it, but *Transformed*, (borrowing the Word from you) and become as *Ceremonious* as was the *Jewish Church under the Law*. And they that highly applaud such Ceremonies, as mighty *Helps to Devotion*, &c. may next tell the World that the *Jewish Church* was *priviledged* above the *Christian*, as having more such *Helps*; (unless they have a Face to say, that the *Ceremonies of God's appointment* were *no such Helps*, as those of *Man's Inventions*.) And consequently that latter Churches (which some take to have been less pure) had some *Helps*, which Christ and his Apostles were not mindful to supply the *Primitive Church* with.

5. It would seem, that if Christ had approved of the appointing of such things, he would rather have appointed them himself, in his Word, (which would have gained them more repute and esteem, and might have ended the *dispute* about them.) There is the *same Reason* for all Churches to observe and practise them, as for ours. 'Tis impossible for you to assign any Reason for the *Cross* in Baptism, &c. *a natura rei*, now, but what would have been as *pleadable* even in the Apostles times, and at all times since. Then is it not most probable, that Christ would have made an *universal Law* for them, that should equally respect all Churches, had it been his Mind to have such things in his Church? Indeed we find, Christ hath *instituted* what *religious Rites and Ceremonies*, he would have observed, in the *Sacraments* of the New Testament. And where he hath determined the matter himself, what have Men to do more, than to *submit to his Determination*? *What can Men do, that come after the King*? None are like to do his work better, or know his Mind better, than himself.

6. If the exerting such a Power be found *contrary to many express Commands* in the Word, how can we imagine such a Power conveyed to Church-Governours in any *general Command* there? The Scripture is no where contrary to it self. Consult *Rom. 14. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, 15, & v. 17*, to the end of the Chapter. And *Chap. 15. 1, 2*. Are there such plain *Commands* in Scripture for *mutual Forbearance*, and against *judging*, and *despi-*



sing one another for such things as God hath not commanded, and against offending the weak, or casting a stumbling-Block in others way, and for preserving the Peace and Unity of the Church; and can we think it probable, or a thing credible, that Christ would have all such Commands set aside, meerly for the sake of things called *indifferent Ceremonies*? Or that the Commands, or Determinations of Church-Governours about such Matters should be of Force against the *standing Rules*, and Laws of Christ, who is King of his Church? *Matters of Order and Decency* are things of another Nature, necessary in genere, as I have said before; and yet Men cannot oblige us to this or that particular Order, when it is repugnant to that, whereunto it should be subservient. Then much less is it the Will of Christ, that meer *indifferent things* (if no worse) should take place of great and necessary Duties. Such indifferent things must either be made necessary, or else you must say, (it cannot be avoided) That the Churches Peace may be broken, sound Ministers, and Christians (that scruple the lawfulness of them) may be ejected, and cast out of Communion, or their Consciences may be ensnared unnecessarily. And yet one that ever read his Bible might know so much, that the Governours of the Church have other work to do. And as the *second Book of Homilies* says (p. 3.) *Better it were, that the Arts of Painting, Plastering, Carving, Graving, and Founding had never been found nor used, than one of them whose Souls in the sight of God are so precious, should by occasion of Image or Picture perish and be lost*: So indeed better it were, that no such Ceremonies had ever been appointed by Men, than one Soul should be ensnared by them, or one Minister or Member of Christ suffer.

7. I query, If Christ had not appointed the Sacraments of the New-Testament, whether it had been in the power of Church-Governours to have appointed *washing with Water in token*, and to put us in mind of our being washed and cleansed by the Blood of Christ, and by the sanctifying influence and operation of his Spirit; and so likewise to have appointed the *eating and drinking of Bread and Wine*, as signifying that our Souls are to feed upon Christ, whose Body was broken, and whose Blood was shed for us? Had not these been of the same Nature, and as lawful as the *significant Ceremonies*, which the Church hath taken on her to appoint? Then let the People understand the Power of the Church, that if Christ had never instituted *Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper*, she could yet have in part supplied that want with those *significant Ceremonies*, that would have been something like them.

8. If Church-Governours have power to appoint such a Ceremony, as the *Cross in Baptism*, (for Instance) then they have power to *add to the thing which God hath commanded*, and to make *new parts of Worship*. But Deut. 4. 2. & 12. 32. forbids that. You grant p. 337. 'That for Men to make new  
'parts

' parts of Divine Worship is unlawful. For that is to suppose the Scripture  
' an imperfect Rule of Worship, and that Superstition is no Fault,  
' &c.

The *Cross in Baptism* is an *Addition*. Tho you seem to understand the prohibition of adding to the Word, of things *directly repugnant*; yet that is not so properly an *Addition*, as an *Abolition*. As one says, *Prohibetur hic additio, non tantum contrarii, (quæ non tam additio est quàm abolitio) sed etiam diverfi.* ( v. M. Poli. Synops. Crit. in Dent. 4. 2. ) Methinks, we may know what it is to *add*, if we understand what it is to *diminish*; then as they might not diminish, or take away from God's Worship one *significant Ceremony* which the Lord had instituted, by a *Parity of Reason* it would seem to follow, that they might not introduce or add one *significant Ceremony* to the Worship, God had instituted.

The *Cross in Baptism* is made a *new part of Worship*. For that which is used in God's Worship in *such a manner*, and to *such an end*, that there needeth nothing but *Divine Institution*, or God's appointing it to be used in that manner, and to that end, to make it a *part of the true Worship of God*, that is made a part of God's Worship, tho falsely, for want of Divine Institution. Had Christ appointed the *Cross in Baptism*, as the Church hath appointed it to be used, in token that we should not be ashamed, &c. had Christ appointed it, by that *Badg* to dedicate us to the Service of him that died upon the *Cross*, no doubt it had thus become a part of God's true Worship. Here you speak short, p. 348. The Canon says, *It is an honourable Badg, whereby the Infant is dedicated to the Service of, &c.* And what is that, but 'a Sign from Men to God, to testify their Subjection? Which by your own Confession there is an *Act of Worship*; and yet you will have it no such thing. P. 355. you say, 'If Christ had instituted it with such Promises--(then) no doubt, &c. And I say, If Christ had instituted it *only in token*, that we ought not to be ashamed to confess him (which is less, than that hereafter we shall not be ashamed) had he appointed it *only to signify our Duty*, it would yet no doubt, have been made a part of Worship. And I hope upon second thoughts, you will say the same.

Some other Passages, relating to this Matter, I would have glanced at; but it is time to hasten to an end of this Conclusion I have been so long upon.

Yet methinks your *slight Exposition* of the *second Commandment*, p. 141, calls for one glance here. Can you find no more in the *Affirmative part* of it, than a *Command to worship God without an Image? What is there more?* And are not even *Mystical Rites and Ceremonies of God's Institution within that Command?* And does not Bishop Downham say, *Is forbidden all Will-Worship and Superstition, whereby Men worship God according to their own Inventions?*



There is no doubt, but that Law forbiddeth other *Inventions* of Men, besides the *worshipping of Images*, or of God by *Images*. And whether the *common Nature* of the *Inventions* there forbidden will not be found agreeing to some of your *Ceremonies*, I suppose will lye fair in others way to take notice of. And so you may have a fuller Answer to that, *pag.* 338. 'What is neither forbidden, Directly, nor by Consequence, is lawful, and may be practised in the Worship of God. And it may seem a little strange, that such learned Men, as have written for the *Cross*, and *kneeling in the Act of Receiving*, &c. should endeavour to prove them lawful by *Consequence* from that Text, *Let all things be done decently*, &c. (whence a more colourable Argument might be drawn *against* them. As, if we suppose such *Ceremonies* there included, it would imply, that the *Worship* of the Apostles, and *Primitive Christians*, was not so *decent*, wanting these *Ceremonies*, as that of our Church, who observe them;) strange it is, I say, that they could not rather see them forbidden by *plainer Consequence* in the second Commandment, and such other Texts, as *Deut.* 4. 2. & 12. 32. *Exod.* 30. 32, 33. *Lev.* 10. 1, 2. *Num.* 15. 39, 40. *Ezek.* 44. 2. *Col.* 2. 20, 21, 22. *Mar.* 7. 5, 6, 7.

*Quest.* 3. Whether every one is bound to submit to such *Ceremonies*, being appointed and enjoined by the Governours of the Church?

And here, 1. I cannot yet find, that you have taken off what you had said, *Irenic.* p. 64. (cited *Rector of Sutton*, p. 14.) "When the Generality of those who use them, do not use them as indifferent, but as necessary things, it ought to be considered, whether in this Case such an Use be allowable?" Now will you allow such Ministers to forbear the use of the Cross in baptizing, till they can find their People better informed, and brought off from any such Superstitious Conceit of that Ceremony? For certain it is, very many (such as are ignorant, and most backward to be instructed) do conceit the *crossing* of their Children *necessary*, as if Baptism could not be rightly administered without it. What if a Minister be scrupulous, and in doubt, whether by the use of the Ceremony he be not guilty of *confirming* them in their *Superstition*? Will you consider such, to take off the Scruples you may have occasioned by this Passage?

2. And what will you say to them, who cannot believe, but they are *made necessary*? When they see them as *strictly imposed* and enjoined, as if they were *Matters of the highest Necessity*; this does not in the least inform, or satisfy them, that you account them, (for all that) but *indifferent things*. Would not that *considerable Person*, you once speak of, *Philip Nye*, have said, *Quid verba audiam cum facta videam*? As he says, *Our Church Governours questionless might have brought in one Rite, or Ceremony*

Ceremony, with the same Liberty to Men's Consciences; that they have done and ther, Scil. The Cross, and Surplice, &c. with the same Liberty, as bowing to the East or Altar. As he also cites, *A Petition of the House of Commons to King James, An. 1610.* Wherein is as follows, Ministers being removed from their Ecclesiastical Livings for not conforming in some Points, it is a great grief to your Majesties Subjects, seeing the whole People that want Instruction are by this means punished. Here I remember what you say of the Vow Corban, (p. 340.) and how they thought their Tradition to over-rule the Law. Then you can clear your Ceremonies, as innocent, and free from any such Crime. And yet it hath sometimes been known, when no Surplice, no Service. And Conformity to the Ceremonies is made so necessary that People must have no Ministers without it. By which means many Souls are at great wants. That you should hold it a thing more pleasing to God, that the Ceremonies be used and kept up, than that the Souls of Men in many places be relieved, and taken care for. And if the Worship of God must rather be omitted, than the Ceremonies, is not this, to set up Men's Traditions above God's Law, and Men's Inventions above Divine Institutions? Many cannot be satisfied with that you tell them, p. 346. That these Ceremonies are purged from Popish Superstition and Error. And therefore all Opinion of Merit and spiritual Efficacy is taken from them; which do make them to be Parts of Divine Worship. They know not that an Opinion of Merit is necessary to any part of Divine Worship. And if you would convince them, that you look on them as no more than naked, indifferent Ceremonies, they could wish; that as you disclaim the Opinion of their spiritual Efficacy and necessity in Word, so they might see that you do it in deed, that none may be deprived of the Means; that God is wont to make effectual, and are ordinarily necessary to Salvation, for the sake of such Ceremonies, which you will not say are effectual, or necessary thereto. And to go on one step further with you here, to (p. 347.) either you must grant such Ceremonies are to be altered, dispensed with in this Case, or you must take them to be unalterable, and then (by your own Confession there) you make them parts of Divine Worship. For (as you say) 'this supposes an equal Necessity. (of them) with that of Divine Institution. And if Men must be without the Word, and without Sacraments, rather than without your Ceremonies; as some have been, and still ordinarily are) then do you not make them of equal Necessity with Divine Institutions, if the preaching of the Word, and Administration of Sacraments be such? And thus have you proved (for us) your Ceremonies to be made parts of Worship. This *John Nibbols* complained of long since, (Plea, &c. p. 120.) That the Reverend Fathers, accounting those things (for which they contend) but meer Trifles, would yet prefer them before the Ministry.



And pag. 229. ( but mispaged ) — *And for not yielding to their Minds, suspended, deprived, and imprisoned their learned and Godly Brethren, and in the mean time preferred the trifling Ceremonies before the weighty work of Preaching.* So that, as Mr. Calfill saith, The People of God be sometimes oppressed with Traditions and Ceremonies; and for outward Solemnities the inward true Service of God is neglected. — *And they could not see all this while any one thing amiss, no, not so much as the unlearned Ministry, or Non-residency; but defend all, and maintain all to the utmost.*

Now if thus it appears, that the Ceremonies are *made necessary*, in being preferred before the Ministry of the Word, if Non-residency, and a Non-preaching Ministry be counted more tolerable than Non-conformity; and if (as you say) by making the Ceremonies of *equal necessity* with God's Ordinances, they are *made parts of Divine Worship*; you will excuse those that cannot submit to them; unless they could be proved of Divine Institution. If they are *things not warranted by the Word* (according to what you have, p. 116.) they should not be *compelled*, they are not bound to use them. No Church-Governours upon Earth have such a Power to *bind men to things not warranted by the Word*. If their Canons enjoin what Christ's Laws forbid, (as the making of any new part of Worship) they are *ipso facto* null and void. King James saith (*Defence of the Right of Kings*, p. 428.) *It is moreover granted, If a King shall command any thing directly contrary to God's Word, and tending to the subverting of the Church; that Clerics in this Case ought not only to dispenſe with Subjects for their Obedience, but also expressly to forbid their Obedience. For it is alwayes better to obey God than Man.* And I hope you would not set up the Power of any Church-Governour *above the King's* here, and *above Christ's*. And what *Episcopius* saith in defence of *Severed Meetings* sometimes against the will of the Magistrate (*Vol. 1. Par. 2. p. 56. col. 2.*) may be applied here to Non-submission (in such case, as is spoken of,) to the Determination of Church-Governours. *Detrectatio autem illa Obedientiæ, non est in Obedientia, nedum resistantia, sed tantum Supremi Juris divini, quod Magistratus sibi injuste adrogat, aut usurpat, debita Recognitionis.* It should not be called Non-submission to our Governours, but rather a due Recognition of the Sovereign Right and Authority of our highest Lord.

For haste I have here thrown things on heaps. A few words now to the third part of your last Conclusion.

3. You say, 'Wholly as to the Form of Government every one is bound to submit to such Determination.'

Here I offer to your Consideration what follows.

1. Whether they that could *submit to Episcopacy as to their Practice*, that is, live peaceably under it, and obey Governours in (*Licetis & Honestis*,) so far

far as God's Law allows, should be urged further, to submit their Judgment to the Divine, or Apostolical Right of Episcopacy, when determined by Governours, whatever their private Judgment may be? Could Bishop Cranmer have declared his Assent to such Determination, whose Judgment was, *That the Bishops and Priests were not two things, but both one Office in the beginning of Christ's Religion,* (as you cite his MS. *Irenic.* p. 392.) could such a Man as Dr. Holland, (and I need not tell you what he was) who called Dr. Laud a Schismatick, for asserting the Divine Right of Episcopacy, saying, *It was to make a Division betwixt the English and other Reformed Churches?* Or could Lud. Capellus have submitted to such Determination, *That it is evident to every one diligently reading holy Scripture, &c.* who in effect says the contrary, *Thes. Salmur,* p. 8. §. 33. *Neq; verò præscripto ullo divino definitum esse putamus, &c.*

And if the like was determined of Arch-Bishops, as of Bishops, I am in some doubt from what I meet with in your *Rational Account*, whether you could submit to such Determination. For there pag. 298. You speak of it, *as a known and received Truth in the Ancient Church,*— 'That the Catholick Church was a Whole consisting of Homogeneous Parts, without any such Subordination or Dependence.— Here I would be satisfied, how you would expound Homogeneous Parts, and so you seem to expound them, p. 300. 'Since the Care and Government of the Church by these Words of Cyprian (*Episcopatus unus*) appears to be equally committed to all the Bishops of the Catholick Church. (But then should not all, that have the Care and Government of the Church committed to them, be supposed to be Bishops; and no one Bishop above another; otherwise how is the Care and Government of the Church equally committed to them; how is there *Episcopatus unus*? And how doth the Church consist of Homogeneous Parts?) And thus will it not follow, that no Constitution higher than that of such Bishops as have the Care and Government of the Church committed to them, (which you here suppose to be with a Parity) should be made the Center of Ecclesiastical Communion? And yet more fully, p. 302. 'When S. Cyprian saith, *Episcopatus unus est, cujus à singulis in solidum Pars tenetur, de Unit. Eccles.* p. 208. That every Part belonging to each Bishop was held in *solidum*, he therein imports that full Right and Power which every Bishop hath over his Charge; and in this Speech he compares the Government of the Church to an Estate held by several Free-holders, in which every one hath a full Right to that Share which belongs to him. Whereas according to your Principles the Government of the Church is like a Mannor or Lordship, in which the several Inhabitants hold at the best but by Copy from the Lord. Now it would be considered, whether in these Words you have not given Metropolitan Churches a shake, if not Diocesan Churches too?



2. Whether you could *submit*, and *declare your Assent*, if lawfull Governours should determine that Bishops were no *Superiour Order* of Divine or *Apostolical Institution*, and should require your Assent? Would you then disown, and discard such, whom you here maintain to be the *Apostles Successors*? For what you say, (*Unreasonableness of Separation*, Preface, p. 89.) we may not think you would ever be afraid or ashamed to own them. For there you tell us, *The Friends of the Church of England will not be either afraid, or ashamed to own her Cause.* — ‘ They must not think, ‘ that we will give up the Cause of the Church for it ( that is, for Union, ‘ or the Churches Peace ) so as to condemn its Constitution, &c. Then you cannot say, that *wholly as to the Form of Government*, every one is bound, for the Churches Peace, to submit to the Determination of Governours, whatever his private Judgment be. Here I have put a Case, wherein you could not submit.

3. What if the whole Work of Government, belonging to the Pastor’s Office, was quite taken out of their hand, that they were made *meer Curats of the Bishop*, and such *Copy-holders*, as must hold nothing but *at the Will of their Lord*? Would you have them bound to *acquiesce* in the *publick Decision*, without doing any thing towards a Reformation? Should they be-  
tray the Churches Interest, *for the Churches Peace*? May they not *endeavour any Alteration*, not so much as by complaining to Governours of such *Exorbitances of Power*, and by humble Petition for Redress?

4. Is every one bound to submit ( wholly as to the Form of Government ) to Governours Determination? Then what if our *Civil Governours*, and the *Ecclesiastical* should differ in their *Judgments*, and *Determinations*? I make no question, but you have one time or other met with that of *Sir Francis Knoller* to my Lord Treasurer *Sir William Cecil*; Moreover, whereas your Lordship said unto me, that the Bishops have forsaken their claim of *Superiority over their Inferiour Brethren* ( lately ) to be by God’s Ordinance, and that now they do only claim *Superiority from her Majesties Supream Government*: If this be true, then it is requisite and necessary, that my Lord of Canterbury do recant and retract his Saying in his Book of the great Volume against Cartwright, where he saith in plain Words ( by the Name of Dr. Whitgift ) that the *Superiority of Bishops is of God’s own Institution*; which Saying doth impugn her Majesties Supream Government directly, and therefore it is to be retracted plainly and truly. And I find something like this, in that small Tract, called (*English Puritanism*, c. 6. §. 6. ) They hold, that all Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deans, Officials, &c. have their Offices and Functions only by Will and Pleasure of the King and Civil States of this Realm; and they hold, that whosoever holdeth that the King may not, without Sin, remove these Officers out of the Church, — or that these Offices are *Jure divino*, and not only or meerly *Jure humano*:

humano: *That all such deny a principal Part of the King's Supremacy, which indeed you must hold, as to Bishops, if you can prove them an Apostolical Institution. Though I know the time when you was of another mind, Rector of Sutton, p. 41. 'Will not all these things make it seem very im- probable that it should be an Apostolical Institution? And pag. 40. you believed, that upon the strictest Enquiry it would be found true, that Jerome, Austin, Ambrose, Sedulius, Primasius, Theodoret, Theophylact, were all for the Identity of both Name and Order of Bishops and Presbyters in the Primitive Church.*

Now suppose the Civil Governours should determine the Government by Bishops, as superiour to the rest of the Clergy, to be only *jure humano*, that they had Power to alter, if they pleased; and should require Assent to this their Determination: and the Ecclesiasticks on the other hand should be of your mind, resolving not to give up the Cause of the Church, or disown its Constitution, and should determine it to be *Jure Divino, vel Apostolico*, and to be owned of Men, as such: In such a Case whether must the former, for the Churches Peace, think themselves bound to submit to the Determinations of the latter? Or to which of their Determinations must others submit? For none, but such as the *Vicar of Bray*, could submit to both.

Thus I have gone over your three Conclusions which you seem to make great account of. What great Service they are like to do you, let the Impartial Reader judg.

Instead of my *third Conclusion*, I would offer to Consideration Chap. 26 of Corbet's *Kingdom of God among Men*. [*of Submission to Things imposed by lawful Authority,*] p. 171, &c.

Particularly, pag. 173. *Though the Ruler be Judg of what Rules he is to prescribe; yet the Conscience of every Subject is to judg with a Judgment of Discretion, whether those Rules be agreeable to the Word of God or not, and so whether his Conformity thereto be lawful or unlawful. Otherwise he must act upon blind Obedience, &c. (with what follows in that Page) And pag. 174. It is much easier for Rulers to relax the strictness of many Injunctions about matters of supposed Convenience, than for Subjects to be enlarged from the strictness of their Judgment. And blessed are they that consider Conscience, and load it not with needless Burdens, but seek to relieve it in its Distresses.*

You go on with me, Preface, p. 74. 'But he urges another Passage in the same Place, viz. That if others cast them wholly out of Communion, their Separation is necessary.—That is no more than hath been always said by our Divines in respect to the Church of Rome. But will not this equally hold against our Church, if it excommunicates those who cannot conform?



Now may not it be said here (as *Rational Account*, p. 336. beginning) 'They did not voluntarily forsake the Communion of your Church, and therefore are no *Schismatics*; but your Carriage and Practices were such as forced them to joyn together in a distinct Communion from you? And may not your own Words (*ibid.* p. 356) be returned, *Scil.* 'That by your own Confession the present Division and Separation lies at your door, if it be not made evident, that there were most just and sufficient Reasons for your casting them out of your Communion. — And supposing any Church (though pretending to be never so Catholick) doth restrain her Communion within such narrow and unjust Bounds, that she declares such excommunicate, who do not approve all such Errors in Doctrine and Corruptions in practice, which the Communion of such a Church may be liable to, the cause of that Division which follows, falls upon that Church which exacts those Conditions, &c.

Here it is to be noted, that your own Words (*Irenic.* p. 123, 124.) objected against you, (*Rector of Sutton*, pag. 30.) are as follow, 'This' (*Scil.* entering into a distinct Society for Worship) I do not assert to be therefore lawful, because some things are required, which Men's Consciences are unsatisfied in; *unless* others proceed to eject and cast them wholly out of Communion on that account, in which Case their Separation is necessary. Whence I inferred, that if Ministers be wrongfully ejected, and wholly cast out of their publick Ministry, for *such things as their Consciences are not satisfied in* (for not conforming in unlawful, or suspected Practices) it becomes necessary for them to have distinct Assemblies in this case (at least) if there be need of their Ministry. Yet I cannot find that you have one word in Answer to this. That one would think, either you knew not well what to say to the Case of the ejected Non-conformists, or that they were so very despicable in your Eye, you thought them not worth taking notice of at all.

Now to your Answers. (1.) 'Our church doth not cast any wholly out of Communion for meer Scrupulous Non-conformity in some particular Rites.

Yet whatever you say here, I doubt, a Man (though he hath his Child lawfully baptized) is not secured from the Sentence of Excommunication, if he bring it not to the Church to be crossed. And though a Man would joyn in the Communion, yet if he be not satisfied to receive the Sacrament kneeling, by the Rules of the Church he is to be debarred from the Sacrament, and then liable to Excommunication for not receiving. And being once excommunicated, I would know what parts of publick Worship the Church allows him to communicate in. Thus there seems to be little more than a Colour and Pretence in this first Answer, if the Rules of the Church be followed.

But

But you further say, *Preface*, p. 74, 75. (2.) 'The Case is vastly different, as to the necessity of our Separation, upon being wholly cast out of Communion by the Church of Rome; and the necessity of others separating from us, supposing a general Excommunication *ipso facto*, against those who publickly defame the Orders of the Church, — In the Church of Rome, we are cast out with an *Anathema*. —

Now 1. If there be a necessity of our Separation from the Church of Rome, upon account of that highest Censure of Excommunication with an *Anathema*, and her pronouncing us *incapable of Salvation*, if we do not return to her Communion, (as you here suppose): why then do you allow a Protestant to join in some parts of Worship in the Roman Church, as in bearing Sermons? &c. (as is plain you do, *pag.* 108.)

2. I shall not oppose you in this, that the general Excommunication *ipso facto* in the *Canons*, lays no Obligation, till it be duly executed. As you say, *pag.* 368, 369. 'General Excommunications although they be *late sententie*, as the Canonists speak, do not affect particular Persons, until the Evidence be notorious, &c. — And the Question is, whether any Person knowing himself to be under such Qualifications which incur a Sentence of Excommunication, be bound to execute this Sentence upon himself? Yet another Question may come in here, *viz.* supposing such a Sentence unjust, though that alone would not justify Separation, whether yet it may not something extenuate it? You are not for extenuating at all, I can bear you witness.

3. And may I not say, that this is answering but by Halves? It never reacheth the Case of so many Ministers, who have been wholly cast out of their publick Ministry. It reacheth not the Case of many private Christians, who have been formally, and actually excommunicated for such Causes, as can never be proved by Scripture to deserve such a Censure and Sentence. You know that Canon of the Council held at *Agatha* (Can. 2. *Carranza*, fol. 159.) that if Bishops excommunicated any unjustly, they were to be admonished by other neighbouring Bishops. And might not the Admonishers have received such into their Communion, whom the other had unjustly cast out? As the Council at *Wormes*, (*Carrenza*, fol. 388. Can. 2. cut short there, as I suppose.) Can. 14th is cited in Mr. B's Church History, p. 275. §. 56. saying, That if Bishops shall excommunicate any wrongfully, or for light Cause, and not restore them, the Neighbour-Bishops shall take such to their Communion, till the next Synod. And to my weak understanding you say nothing here to what you have *Iren.* p. 119, 120. where you fairly clear Non-conformists, but lay the Imputation of Schism upon those who require such Conditions of Communion, as they cannot conform unto for Conscience-sake. The very requiring of such Conditions, you would have there to be



no less than *an ejecting Men out of Communion*. And therefore I should wonder, if by being *wholly cast out of Communion*, you then meant only being *excommunicated with an Anathema*. As I doubt not, but Separation is as necessary, where one cannot have Communion, with-out *joyning in unlawful or suspected Practices*, as where one is formally *excommunicated*, yea, and if an *Anathema* were annex to the Sentencetoo.

You add, (3.) 'That Author could not possibly mean, that there was an equal Reason in these Cases, when he expressly determines, that in the case of our Church, Men are bound in Conscience to submit to the Orders of it; being only about Matters of Decency and Order, and such things which in the Judgment of the Primitive and Reformed Churches are left undetermined by the Law of God.

Here 1. Be pleased to note, that as much as you seem taken with, and hug this Conceit of yours, (as you have it once and again here, and likewise in your *Conferences*, p. 171. as if you thought it would do you *Knights Service*) yet it remains wholly unproved, that the things imposed are only *Matters of Decency and Order*. (Still I conceive, that if Man only had appointed such a use of *Bread and Wine*, to signify and put us in remembrance of Christ's Body broken, and his Blood shed for us, it had been something more than a *meer matter of Decency and Order*, or something worse. And whether the same may not be said of the *Sign of the Cross*, I am in doubt; for they seem to be parallel.) And so it neither is, nor ever can be proved that *such Imposition of such things, in the Judgment both of the Primitive, and of all Reformed Churches*, is allowable by God's Law; and that Men are bound to submit to them, whether they are satisfied about them, or not.

2. When you say, *The Author of Irenicum could not possibly mean, that there was an equal Reason in these Cases*; I would fain know what those Words mean, *Irenic*. p. 119. (cited *Reclor of Sutton*, p. 21.) 'Let Men turn and wind themselves which way they will, by the very same Arguments that any will prove Separation from the Church of Rome lawful, because she required unlawful things, as Conditions of her Communion, it will be proved lawful not to conform to any suspected or unlawful Practice required by any Church-Governours upon the same Terms, if the things so required be, after serious and sober Enquiry, judged unwarrantable by a Man's own Conscience. Did you not here suppose some Equality in these Cases? And which way did you *wind and turn your self*, to get off from those Arguments?

3. And let me say this further, How could you then possibly mean, that Men should be bound in Conscience to submit to significant Ceremonies. as *meer Matters of Order and Decency*, when you so plainly distinguished them, *Iren.* pag:

pag. 67. And say of such Ceremonies, that *their Lawfulness may with better ground be scrupled*, p. 68. (cited *Recl. of Sutton*, p. 16.) Could you then possibly mean, that such Ceremonies, and Matters of Order and Decency were all one? certainly you could not, any further than you might possibly contradict your self.

Preface, p. 76. 'And so much shall serve to clear the Agreement between the Rector of *Sutton*, and the Dean of *St. Paul's*.

But if this be all you have to say, they are not yet well agreed. And whether there be not the like Disagreement betwixt your *Rational Account*, and this your *Impartial Account*, where I have compared them, let the Indifferent and *Impartial* Reader judg.

Thus I have gone thorow so much of your *Preface*, as I am concerned in.

As you take little notice of me in your *Book*, I have little more to say. I would not take others Work out of their hands, who are (by so great odds) fitter for it.

The first place where I find *Rector of Sutton* cited, is p. 95. There you take notice, how far I say, we agree with you; but you over-look what follows upon it, that it seems very hard, that notwithstanding you break with us for things you count but *Trifles*, yet would be *Sins* to us. Will you grant, that such as agree with you in *all things necessary*, may not, should not be *debarred* Communion, by *imposing things unnecessary*? Or will you assert the contrary, and prove it?

Again, pag. 98. You cite *Rector of Sutton*, p. 35. *All the Parish-Ministers are not near sufficient for so populous a City*. And can you say, they are sufficient? Is there no need of more? Why then do you say, 'This is but a Colour, and Pretence. The case is plain, that there is real need of more Ministers, than are in place. And I desired to know, whether it was better that Men should be untaught, (and so perish for lack of Knowledge) than taught by such as the Non-conformists? Whether the Souls of Men are of no more value, than our Ceremonies? But as yet I have no Answer from you, that may satisfy.

What you further say to me p. 137. I have fully answered before.

Again, pag. 144. You cite a few Words of mine, wick I know to be true of some, and pitty them. And though it is said, *we would certainly give but bad Quarter to others*; yet I hope if I had been all this time in place, for me, they should have had their Liberty to hear those they were better satisfied with, and could profit more by.

Pag. 168, 169. You contradict not what I said *Rector of Sutton*, p. 15, 16. Only make a little use of it, as seem'd to serve your purpose there; while yet it stands good against you.



Pag. 196. You do not *fully set down my meaning*; though it was plain enough, *Reſtor of Sutton*, p. 42. Neither do you take any notice of what you had ſaid your ſelf, *Irenic*. p. 65. though you there meet with it again. Wherefore I wonder how you could overlook it. If that *Council at Gangre*, had enjoyned the religious uſe of a *peculiar habit*, appropriate to the Service of God, and others had reſuſed to ſubmit to it, I queſtion then, whether the Council would not have been the *Schiſmaticks*! (As, whether any, without being guilty of making a Schiſm, can exclude and ſilence Miniſters for *wearing Beards*, or for not obeying ſuch a trifling command as that was, *Mr. B. Church-Hiſtory*, p. 360, 361. §. 55.) But upon that matter of the Council's condemning the followers of *Euſt. Sebaſtenus*, I ſtill query, whether you ought not to make a difference betwixt ſuch as *ſeparated meerly upon pretence of Purity*, while they were indeed defiled with groſs Errors both in Opinion and Practice, (as I there ſhewed;) and ſuch as are *neceſſitated* to withdraw, and cannot otherwiſe *keep their Conſciences pure*? This you ſhould conſider. As *Chillingworth* ſays, p. 282. § 71. *A Murderer can cry, Not Guilty, as well as an innocent Perſon, but not ſo truly, nor ſo juſtly.* And *P. Martyr* (Loc. Com. cl. 4. l. 6. p. 894.) *Si quædam partes ab eo (toto) ſe dividant, quod vitari & infici nolint, diſceſſio erit laudabilis.*

The ſeventh and laſt place, where you take notice of me is, p 307. And there I am brought in, as concluding with and for you, about your *National Church*.

But if we are agreed herein, why then do you call that which I ſay of it, (*Reſtor of Sutton*, p. 20, 21.) *A weak Assault*, as you do implicitly, p. 303. § 23. *Aſſaulting* (tho never ſo weakly) is not agreeing, but quite different, or rather contrary. But there I ſay, 1. That *we will thank you if you can prove the National Church of England, as it is now eſtabliſhed, to ſubſiſt by a Divine Law, and poſitive Inſtitution of Chriſt.* 2. I put it to the queſtion, whether it be not *Schiſmatical*, for any *National Church* to make ſuch *Terms of Agreement and Communion*, as are not agreeable to that ſame Rule, by which all Chriſtians ought to walk? (And that your Terms are ſuch, is eaſy to prove from your own Words there recited) And whether they that ſo far ſeparate from ſuch a *dividing National Church*, tho they comply not with its eſtabliſhed Rule, may not yet be found *walking by the ſame Rule*, in the true ſence of your Text? Yet theſe things you thought fit to paſs by, and would notwithstanding perſuade your Readers (that had rather *take your Word*, than be at any pains to compare things together) that *we are agreed*, and *this point is thought fit to be given up*.

And yet I do not deny, but Chriſtians of whatſoever Society, (whether a leſs or greater) ſhould be for uniting ſo far as they can, to preſerve and ſtrengthen the Society, and to promote true Religion and Chriſtianity. So

I agree with you in what you say, p. 292. 'The best way of the Churches Preservation is by an Union of the Members of it; provided the Union be such as doth not overthrow the ends of it. And doubtless this is a good and necessary *Proviso*. For that which *overthrows the ends of Union*, is a *wicked Conspiracy* against Christ and his Church, rather than true *Christian Unity*, or *Concord*. But then it should be considered, if a National Church sets down such Terms of Union, as have no tendency to promote the common cause of Religion, and true *Interest of Christianity*, such terms as are sure to *cause Dissention*, as evidently tend to *divide*, break and shatter the Society, whether the Churches Preservation be therein truly consulted, or any way likely to be thereby secured? And whether (as Mr. Corbet says, *Kingdom of God*, &c. p. 155.) *The Constitution of the Church should not be set as much as may be for the encompassing of all true Christians, which indeed makes for its most fixed and ample state?* And whether the taking of a narrower compass, be not a fundamental Error in its Policy, and will not always hinder its stability and increase?

Thus I think I have spoken to all the Passages in your Book, wherein I am properly concerned.

Yet am I not at an end of my Task. In your *Preface* you direct me to *three Letters* you have *subjoined* to your *Treatise*.

*Preface*, p. 76. You say, 'There is one thing more which this Author takes notice of— (*Rector of Sutton*, p. 6.) If we are condemned by others abroad, we may thank our Friends at home, who have misrepresented us to the World, while we have not been allowed to plead for ourselves. 'Therefore, to give satisfaction, as to the Judgment of some of the most eminent and learned Protestant Divines abroad, now living, I have subjoined to the following *Treatise*, some late Letters of theirs, &c.

Now whether you have put these Letters in print with the consent of those that wrote them, or by some *Law* or *Priviledg peculiar to your self*, I know not, nor shall I trouble my self to enquire.

And whether they were procured on purpose, to grace and set off this Book of yours, (as by their Date they appear to have come lately, as you say, the first written in *September* (80.) The second in *October*. The third in *November*.) this however is not very material. But it is likely some may think your *Five Answerers confronted* and confounded, with the Authority of these *three Letters* of some of the most eminent and learned Protestant Divines abroad now living. Yet to tell you my Thoughts, I could not but think thus with my self, That if we had no more cause to fear a *French-Army* confusing us by *Club-Law*, than that any eminent *French Protestant Divines* would condemn us (if they thorowly examined, and knew our Cause) we were so far safe enough.

Now



Now as to these *Letters*, it concerns not me to descant on the whole : but especially to enquire, and observe, *whether it be not, as I said.* Or as Calvin wrote to Dr. Cox and his Brethren (*Ep. 165.* as you have it not far from the beginning of your *Book. p. 12.*) ‘ That the state of the Case at *Frankford*, had not been truly represented to him, which made him write ‘ with greater sharpness than otherwise he would have done. I think, we shall see it plain, That either they had not *the true state of our Case* laid before them, or if they had, then they wrote very much besides it. I suppose their *Letters* here faithfully translated.

### *The First Letter is from Monsieur Le Moyne.*

**T**HO I find a Letter of the same Persons formerly published, wherein it is said, *he thought himself abused, sundry Passages in his Letter*, moderating and regulating the Episcopal Power, *being left out* (*Bonaf. Vapul. p. 80, 81.*) Yet I must not suppose any such thing here, unless I could prove it.

But from what is here published, P. 404. ‘ I could not have persuaded my ‘ self, that there had been so much as one, which had believed, that a Man ‘ could not be of her Communion, without hazarding his own Salvation. — ‘ It is a very strange thing to see them come to that Extream, as to ‘ believe that a Man cannot be saved in the Church of *England*. And p. 408. ‘ Is it not horrible Impudence, to excommunicate her without Mercy, — ‘ for them to imagine that they are the only Men in *England* — that hold ‘ the Truths necessary to Salvation, as they ought to be held? ] From hence is it not plain now, that either he understood not the *matter of difference* betwixt the Conformists, and Non-conformists; or else did here forget it? Had M. Le Moyne consulted and perused your Sermon (which possibly was the Occasion of those Writings that M. de L’ Angle seems to condemn unseen, p. 420, 423.) had he only read what you say, p. 21. ‘ I will ‘ not make the Difference wider than it is, — 1. ‘ They unanimously confess ‘ they find no Fault with the Doctrine of our Church, and can freely subscribe to all the Doctrinal Articles. — Well then, *the case is vastly different* ‘ as to their Separation from us, and our Separation from the Church of ‘ Rome — 2. They generally yield, That our Parochial Churches are true ‘ Churches — They do not deny, That we have all the Essentials of true ‘ Churches, true Doctrine, true Sacraments. — 3. Many of them declare, ‘ that they hold Communion with our Churches to be lawful. ] Or had he seen

seen what you write here, p. 95. how all your Answerers agree with you in the *Doctrine of the Church of England*; and as Dr. Owen says, we are firmly united with you in *Confession of the same Faith*; had these things been in his Eye, surely, he could not have written at this Rate, as if we thought, we were the only Men in England that held the Truths necessary to Salvation. So I leave you your self to judg, whether M. Le Moyne goes not upon a great Mistake. Sure I am, that either he, or you, have greatly misrepresented us, (as every ordinary Capacity, by comparing what I have here set down, may readily discern.) If what he says of us here be true, what you say must needs be false. Now I do the more willingly appeal to your Judgment here, touching these things, whereof we are accused, because I know you are expert in the Questions that are amongst us. Say then, Whether ever any such Controversie arose betwixt the Conformists and Non-conformists? Let me hear of one Non-conformist, that ever asserted, That a Man could not be saved in the Communion of the Church of England, or, that no Conformist could be saved. Yet this learned Professor would have them all to be such. As is too plain from that very odious Parallel, which he says (p. 408.) 'One might make, — betwixt them and the Donatists. — Betwixt them and those of the Roman Communion, who have so good an Opinion of their own Church, that out of her they do not imagine that any one can ever be saved. (As for his comparing them with Pope Victor, some will smile at it, as more fitly agreeing to others that are for excommunicating Christians, for meer Non-conformity in matters of Ceremonies. And no better will the Comparison hold betwixt them and the Audeans (or Antropomorphites) as whosoever reads what Antiquity says of them, may perceive. If they were against rich Bishops, that is not to the Point. If our Bishops would be content with their Riches, and quit their claim of Divine Right, (till it can be proved) or not require our Acknowledgment of it, before we believe it, nor impose such things on us, as we are sure, and can prove from what they wrote, the Apostles would never have imposed, whose Successors they pretend to be; then I doubt not we could accord with them. (So that here also he shoots wide.)

And thus alas, by overdoing, he hath hitherto done just nothing for you. I know, Sir, that you to whose Judgment I here appeal, must needs acquit us from that Uncharitableness we are here charged with. Or we are not the Men he speaks of, we are not arrived to that horrible Impudence to excommunicate all of your Communion without Mercy. We are not like the Donatists, or those of the Roman Communion, not as here we are represented. And so, if Dr. Potter's word may be taken, we are to be cleared and acquitted from the charge of Schism. As he says (Answer to Charity mistaken Sect. 3. p. 75. printed at Oxford 1633.) This clears us



from the Imputation of Schism, whose Property it is, ( *winning the Donatists and Luciferians,* ) to cut off from the Body of Christ, and the Hope of Salvation, the Church from which it separates. Can you find any such Separatists amongst those, who yet remain firmly united to you in the Confession of the same Faith? We differ only ( as I said, Rector of Sutton, p. 31. ) as to certain ( external ) accidental Forms, Modes, and Rites, which the Church of England cannot say are necessary, and appear to us as things at least to be suspected, and yet they are obtruded and imposed with as much Rigor and Strictness, as if they were most highly necessary. We doubt not yet, but there are sober and truly pious Conformists, whose Consciences do not scruple the Lawfulness of these things. But here I would say, as Dr. Potter ( *ibid* p. 76. ) To him who in simplicity of heart believes ( them to be lawful ) and practiseth them, and withal feareth God and worketh Righteousness, to him they shall prove Venial. Such a one shall by the Mercy of God, either be delivered from them, or saved with them. But he that against Faith and Conscience, shall go along with the Stream, to profess and practise them, because they are but little Ones; his Case is dangerous, and without Repentance desperate. So though the learned Professor compares the present Dissenters ( because he knows them not ) with the Donatists, I may here borrow an Expression of Chillingworth's ( p. 312. §. 111. ) Though they did the same Action, yet doing it upon different Grounds, it might in the one merit Applause, ( or Approbation ) and in the other Condemnation.

And what follows in this Letter, pag. 408. still proves, that he knows not the Men, or their Principles, whom he here condemns. 'For my part ( says he ) as much inclined to Toleration as I am, I cannot for all this perswade my self, that it ought to be allowed to those that have so little of it for other Men; and who, if they were Masters, would certainly give but bad Quarter to those that depended upon them. To which I shall say but this, One would think, they that would have Christ's Army consist of Volunteers, and not of press'd Men, ( as the Lord of Falkland is for it, pag. 226. ) they should not be for giving bad Quarter; otherwise it could not be expected, that the Volunteers would come in very freely to them. One would think, Christians could not expect better Quarter from any, than from those, who would have all admitted upon Catholick Terms.

Other Passages in this Letter I am not so concerned in. Otherwise his arguing from Success and Providence, pag. 404. might be questioned. And what is said of the Confession and Articles of Faith, p. 405. [ 'Can there be any thing more unjust, than to say, that an Instrument which God hath heretofore employed for the Instruction of so many People, for the Consolation of so many good Men, for the Salvation of so many Believers,

‘vers, is now become a destructive and pernicious Thing? ] May not the like be truly said of the *Ministry* of many *Non-conformists*, both heretofore, and to this present day? Hath not God made them *Instruments* of the *Conversion and Salvation* of many Souls? *How then is their Ministry become a destructive and pernicious thing?*

Further, I am confident, you will not, you cannot say, as he does, p. 406. that ‘for the space of 1500 Years, all the Churches in the World had no other Government, than Episcopal; you have asserted the contrary, (as I said, *Rector of Sutton*, p. 41.) and I fear not your retracting here.

But it is likely, what he says, pag. 409. will please you. ‘For to speak the Truth, I do not see that their Meetings are of any great Use, — when I was at London, — I went to several of their private Assemblies, to see what way they took for the Instruction of the People, and the preaching of the Word of God. But I profess I was not at all edified by it.

And is this *Truth*? Where was the Fault then? would be my next Question, (if I had opportunity to speak with him.) By this Passage, it would seem, their *Preaching is of no use*, if one cannot be at all edified by it. And are such *Discourses*, as those in the *Supplement* to the morning Exercise, of no use? And the Lectures in the morning Exercise against Popery, of no use? Were the Labours of such worthy, learned, excellent Men as Ames, Brightman, Broughton, Ball, Bradshaw, Cartwright, Baynes, Cotton, Hooker, Shepherd, Norton, Burroughs, Hildersham, (whose way of preaching, a worthy Conformist lately said he wished the present Clergy would imitate) Hooker, Dod, Parker, Dr. Drake, Dr. Kendell, Dr. Burgeß, &c. and of late, Dr. Tuckney, Dr. Spurstow, Dr. Wilkinson, Dr. Seaman, Dr. Manton, Dr. Goodwin, (I speak of such as are dead, whose Works follow them, and some of which I hope will remain) Dr. Grew, Dr. Bryan, Dr. Staunton, Dr. Temple, Dr. Holmes, and of such as Mr. Calamy, Corbet, Bridges, Rich. and Joseph Alleyn, Angier, Wadsworth, Wells, Swinock, Newcomen, Caryl, Greenhill, Nalton, Roe, Reyner, Jeans, Traman, A. Jackson, Thomas Adams, Ant. Burgeß, Ralph Robinson, John Gibbons, Cawton, Charnock, Theoph. Gale, &c. Ol. Haywood, J. Shaw, Thomas Vincent, and Matthew Pool, (so well known by his learned and useful *Synopsis Criticor.*) all of no use? Now they rest from their Labours, yet do not many of their Works praise them in the Gates? Did he not consult the Writings of many of the *Non-conformists* yet living, viz. Dr. Jacomb, Dr. Owen, Dr. Bates, Dr. Wilkinson, Dr. Collins, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Ham, Mr. Woodbridge, Mr. Clarkson, Mr. Sam. Cradock? But how rare a Preacher must we suppose him to be, who heard one of the most famous Preachers of the *Non-conformists* in London, and says of what he heard, that it seemed



nothing to the purpose? And yet some *Conformists* have been known to transcribe, and preach some of their Sermons almost *verbatim*. I hope, such thought them to be of some use. I say not this of all, or the most. Not only such as the friendly *Debator* would scorn it, but many others that could not satisfy themselves to serve God with that which cost them nothing. But if there are but two such in a County, Two are some. And then will it not follow, that People should not hear them? For it seems, the best Sermons they are known to preach, are of no use.

But a little before these blunt Passages, p. 409. he speaks very right, if his Words be rightly expounded, and applied. — ‘They should do all for a good Agreement; and in the present Conjunction of Affairs, they should understand that there is nothing but a good Re-union, that can prevent the Evils with which *England* is threatned.

Thus others at a distance can fore-see Ruine coming upon us by our sad Divisions; and yet we that are so near to Ruine, cannot, or will not see it. The good Lord make those sensible of these things, who might do most to promote a good Agreement, and happy Union, and thereby prevent our Ruine and Confusion.

But alas! what can we do here in comparison of you? *Id tantum possumus, quod jure possumus*. We must not sin against Consciences. Certainly, that could not be a good Agreement, which is made up by Sin. Would others condescend to our Weakness (if they will not have it called *Tenderness* of Conscience) I say, would they condescend, only so far as they might certainly without Sin, where we could not submit without sinning; then I doubt not, a good Agreement would soon follow. And as the Lord of Faulkland, p. 235. I am confident, that all who receive the Scripture for the only Rule, and believe what is there plain to be only necessary, would (if they truly believed what they profess, and were not led aside either by Prejudice or private Ends, or some Popish Relicks of holding what they have long been taught, or following the Authority of some (by them much esteemed) Persons either alive or dead) soon agree in as much as is necessary, and in concluding no Necessity of agreeing in more; there being no doubt, but it would soon appear plainly what is plain. To my understanding, there is more in these few Lines to shew the way to a good Agreement, than in all your Sermon, and this Book, and Letters taken in too. We readily agree with you in all that is necessary; and if you (for your parts) would but conclude there is no necessity of agreeing in more, I cannot see what can hinder a mutual good Agreement.

Page 410. And seeing the good of the State and Church depends absolutely upon the Union of the People in the Point of Religion, one cannot there press an universal Union too much. But it ought to be procured by good means.

An *Union in Religion* may be without *Uniformity in Ceremonies*. You will not own it, that you place *Religion* in these, that they are any *parts of Religion*. But the pressing of such unnecessary doubtful things upon Men, about which many are and ever will be dissatisfied, seems no good, nor probable means to procure an *Universal Union*. That *Prudence and Charity* (which this-Professor afterwards commends, as *necessary in this Work*) would (in my simple Judgment) direct to other Means and Methods.

### *Notes upon the Second Letter, from Monsieur de L'Angle.*

**A**DD P. 420. I have not met with such *Writings*, said to be lately published, to make Men believe that *Communion with the Church of England is unlawful*, and that the *Ministers cannot permit it to private Persons without sinning*. Or if I have seen any such, they are quite out of my Mind.

As to the former of these, do but allow them to distinguish, as you do in your *Rational Account*, and they will say, They have communion with the Church of England, so far as it is a Church, and very many of them have ordinary Communion in the self-same Worship, so far as it is God's Worship. And what is *redundant*, it is not necessary that they should have Communion in. It is one thing to say, Communion with the Church of England is simply unlawful, unlawful in it self, and to unto all Men; and another, to say that Communion in the *Liturgies*, or *Ceremonies* is unlawful to them, who cannot yet be satisfied that they are lawful.

But we are further supposed to believe, that Communion with the Church of England is intolerable, in what follows, that the *Ministers cannot permit it to private Persons without sinning*. Here let every one so far as they are called to it, speak for themselves. For my part, I have never made it any of my Work (God, and Men are Witnesses) to warn others to take heed how they had Communion with the Church of England. I have never told any living Soul, that I should sin, if I did not forbid their joyning with Parochial Congregations. Rather it should be my Prayer, I am sure it is my Heart's desire, that sober Conformists, and Non-conformists might once come to joyn each with other, notwithstanding their lesser Differences. But it seems, it is not permitted to you to have Communion with such at Dr. O. and Mr. B. tho you may have Communion with others, from whom you differ in greater Matters (both as to your Judgments, and Practices too) while they do but conform. Then is there not some strange secret Virtue, or Inchantment in this Chain of Conformity? It can congregate the heterogeneous, while it separates those who are more homogeneous.

But



But that this is not the Doctrine of the Non-conformists, that they cannot permit private Persons to have Communion with you, without sinning, I am very apt to conclude, because M. Le Moyne went to several of their private Assemblies, while he was at London, and could never hear any such thing from any of them. Otherwise sure, he that could remember the citing of Pliny, and Vitruvius a hundred times in one Sermon, and tell us of it five years after, (tho I doubt his being so busy in casting up such Accounts, might be the cause he was not at all edified by the Sermon) would not have failed to take notice of such a thing as that, being more pertinent and material. And for the same Reason (with others) I cannot believe what follows here, p. 423. That 'The Bugbear Words of Tyranny, Oppression, Limbs of Antichrist, are continually beaten into the Peoples Ears. If so, M. Le Moyne had been as likely as any Person to have caught at them; and then had we heard of them again.

But further, some of us have the very same to say, that this Learned Person says, (P. 420, 421.) That 'In frequenting your Assemblies, and preaching too in Congregations that are under the Jurisdiction of the Church of England, (when we could enjoy the Priviledg, which indeed hath been very rarely) we have thus also shewn, that we do not believe her Communion to be unlawful.

Add P. 422. 'Schism is the most formidable Evil that can befall the Church: and for the avoiding of this, Christian Charity obliges all good Men to bear with their Brethren in some things, much less tolerable than those of which the dispute is, ought to seem, even in the Eyes of those that have the most aversion from them.

I thought it would appear, that these eminent, learned Men did not rightly, and fully understand our case. So the former speaks, as if we did excommunicate the Church of England without Mercy; When alas! we are rather under her Excommunication. And this learned Person speaks, as if we had not so much Christian Charity as to bear with our Brethren, in the use of a few Ceremonies: but that is not the thing in Question. Many of us (at least) could, and do bear with your Conformity, and joyn with you notwithstanding. But will it not follow from his own Words, That Christian Charity obliges you to bear with our Non-conformity, yet you will not bear with us? I hope you would be counted good Men. Now he says, Christian Charity obliges all good Men to bear with their Brethren in some things much less tolerable, than those of which the dispute is. The Apostle gives Timothy a very solemn Charge (then are not Bishops concerned in it, if Timothy was a Bishop?) 1 Tim. 5. 21. I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Elect Angels, that thou observe these things, without preferring one before another, doing nothing by Partiality. And one of these things,

he was to observe, we find, v. 17. *Let the Elders that rule well, be counted worthy of double Honour, especially they who labour in the Word and Doctrine.* Yet how many that have been called to the work of the Ministry, how many of your Brethren, that would gladly labour in the work they have been called unto; and you have been doing them what dishonour you can, loading them with the charge of *Schism* and *unreasonable Separation*, while you can bear with things *much less tolerable* in others? Is this your *Christian Charity*? Or *doing nothing by Partiality*? Are there no Non-conformists, that use to hear you, when they have Opportunity? I am apt to think there are. And thus they bear with you, as to matters in dispute, farther than you are seen to bear with them.

But this must be noted, It is one thing for us to *bear with* your Conformity, and another thing by Word and Deed to *declare our approbation* of Conformity, or to conform merely because you do so, and require us to do so, tho we suspect it to be sinful. As the Lord Faulkland ( I chuse oft to speak to you in others Words; because I suppose if I spake the same things in my own Words, they would not be so much regarded ) Reply p. 214. *If they have any never so slight Errors, and which appears so to me, which yet they will force me to subscribe to, (and this you know is our case, which M. de L'Angle seems to be ignorant of, or else forgot himself, and in these Lines (I am upon) went quite besides it) if I communicate with them, my Assent would be damnable, or if they require the same Subscription to some Truths, which yet after my real endeavours in enquiry, appear Errors to me, I doubt not but my refusal is no way damnable.* Something more you have immediately before. This is home, and answers M. de L'Angle's charging us with *committing a very great Sin.*

And where he cites Calvin, and Bera, p. 422. We may well be confident, that they could not have submitted to such Terms, as are put upon us. And if he himself had submitted unto all that is required of us, when he was here in England, had he submitted to *Re-ordination*, and owned Bishops, as a distinct order from Presbyters, of *Apostolical Institution*, I very much question, whether it might not have *drawn the displeasure of his Brethren* upon him, if not *their Censure at his return*, as he speaks p. 421.

Add p. 423. When I see what he says of the *First Authors of the Separation*, I cannot but wish he had known them. He condemns some *Writings*, as *unreasonable and passionate*, possibly he may mean our *Answers to your Sermon*: but then for ought appearing in this Letter, very probably he hath not seen them. Yet after all, he comes to plead for Dissenters. —

‘ There is a very great number of good Men, whose Faith is Pure, and whose Piety is Sincere, (This Testimony I hope is true) and who remain ‘ Separate from you only because their Simplicity is surprized, &c. And  
 whe-



whether he should not have had the like *Charity* for very many Ministers, as he hath for very many of their Hearers, may be a question? I rank these with those weak ones, who said they were not of the Body; and of whom St. Paul said they were of the Body for all that.

So why may not they, who are of the *same Faith*, and have the *same Worship* for substance, be acknowledged as *Brethren*, and still owned as in *Communion with the Body*; tho they have not the same Ceremonies, which are meer *Shadows*?

But he speaks more fully to the purpose, p. 424. — 'And I am sure, (I wish he could make us sure here) That if there were nothing wanting to cure it, but the abstaining from some Expressions, the quitting some Ceremonies, and the changing the Colour of some Habits, you would resolve to do that, and something more difficult than that, with great Pleasure.

From hence, as from that earnest Expression he hath in the Page foregoing, [ 'In the name of God then, do all that possibly you can : ] One would easily infer, that he was little acquainted with the *Case*, he understood not where we have stuck, what hath thus long hindred our *full Communion* with the Church of *England*. Otherwise, for ought I can perceive here, we might have had him pleading for us, that such matters of difference might be quite removed, or at least that they might not be urged, and imposed. And by what immediately followeth there, p. 424. it appears, he is a great Stranger to the *Savoy-Conference*, never truly understood how Matters were carried, or who have been the Obstructors of Union. Had the Non-conformists then, or at any time since, refused to hearken and submit to fair and just Proposals, which would not have pinched at all on that part, which should be kept tender in every one; Then had they been extreamly to blame, and had stood very much in their own Light. But God allows us not to break our Peace with him and our own Consciences, for Peace with Men; neither can true *Piety*, *Zeal*, and *Charity* (three Cardinal Vertues which he commendeth in our Bishops, and prayeth they may be increased more and more) require so much of us, which is not in our Power to grant and yield unto. But seeing (as he says afterwards) he should be *past all comfort, if he should not see some new Attempt at least made for the success of a work so holy, and of such Consequence, in a time that seems so proper for it;* and Thousands more may say the like, who truly prefer *Jerusalem's Welfare* before their *chiefest Joy*; I cannot but pray that those, who are chiefly concerned; may have all the *Qualities of the Head and the Heart*, which are necessary to make them able and willing to contribute to this good Work.

*Upon the Third Letter from Monsieur Claude.*

**A**DD P. 439. Tho he says, the distinction betwixt the Bishop and Priest is very *Antient*; yet had he been required to own this Distinction, as grounded on the Word of God, and to assert the Right of Episcopacy as of *Apostolical Institution*, I very much question, whether this would not have gravelled him.

Add P. 440. I believe, there are very few to be found amongst us, that question the Ordination of all ordained by Bishops. And many would be glad, if it was permitted, that some of you would sometimes help us in our Meetings.

Where he speaks of Christian Unity and Concord, to my poor understanding Mr. Corbet speaks more soundly, accurately, and distinctly.

P. 441. He is expressly against *Tyranny over the Soul*, and *Mens forcing the Conscience, by imposing a necessity to believe that which they believe, and to practise that which they practise* (where we must suppose the things themselves are not necessary.) And according to what follows, in this case, 'The external Communion ceases of right, and there is not any that is lawful to be had any more with such. Was there not need of an *Index Expurgatorius* here? This makes something for Dissenters, and pinches some where else. And what follows that, [We do not believe that a single difference of Government or Discipline, nor even a difference of Ceremonies innocent in their own Nature, is a sufficient occasion to break the sacred bond of Communion] is little to your purpose. I think, a *single difference* of Ceremonies should not break Communion, where there is an *Union in the same Faith*, and in things necessary. But there is more than a *single difference* of Ceremonies, where *no difference is allowed*, but the same Ceremonies are imposed on all, tho one part cannot look on them as *innocent Ceremonies*.

P. 442. Speaking of the Protestant Churches in France, he says, 'We utterly disapprove and see with Grief, certain Extrems, whereinto some of the one side, and the other do cast themselves. The one looking upon Episcopacy as an order so absolutely necessary, that without it there can be no Ecclesiastical Society, &c.

Then according to them, there may be *true Churches, true Ministers*, without Bishops. And as they are ready to receive Ministers *Episcopally ordained*, (P. 440.) so they should think it an *Extrem*, if we will not own such for Ministers, as have been *ordained by a Presbytery*, (and that when



there were not Bishops at hand to ordain.) If we will force such to be re-ordained, or will not admit of them as Ministers, this is an Extream with them.

Add P. 443. Let not Men domineer over their Faith and Consciences, (a thing destructive to Religion) and I hope they would not be for rejecting the Bridle of Discipline, nor for shaking off the whole yoke of Government, nor for depriving themselves of the Succours which might be drawn out of a general Union, for to strengthen them in the true Faith, and in true Piety. But they cannot apprehend, that the things imposed will ever contribute any thing to either of these.

Pag. 444. He seems to suppose, they are kept off, only from an Apprehension of some unpleasant Inconveniencies in the Episcopal Government: whereas generally it is not the Government it self, but some particular Matters imposed, which they cannot with a good Conscience submit unto, which causes the distance.

So, add P. 447. Tho I have opportunity of conversing with very few, yet I cannot think there is a Man, of all those that believe the Presbyterian Government is more agreeable to Scripture-Rule, than our Pralatical, that stands off meerly because he cannot have what in his Judgment he prefers, as the better Government. So what he says towards the end of the same page, [‘The Question here is not about the esse, or the bene esse, but only about the melius esse, that they dispute with you —’] fully proves, (as I said) that indeed they know not the true state of our Case, as we see plainly, he is quite beside the Point we stick at.

Now I look back a little again.

Add P. 445. — ‘The Bond of Christian Charity doth not only joyn us with some of our Brethren, but with all our Brethren, to receive from them, and to give them Edification by living together in the same Communion.’

Then let the World judg (by this Rule) who have most Christian Charity, You, or the Non-conformists. Many of these hear and joyn with you, so far as lawfully they can, and have opportunity; whereas few or none of you will hear, or joyn with them. And yet you are sometimes pleased to call them Brethren.

By what follows, it still appears, he understood not the Case, or was beside it. How many that approve not of the Government, yet could submit to it, did it not require any thing but what they are satisfied is agreeable to the Word? And both parts agree, that God’s Word ought to be the Rule of our Worship. What else is there considerable, I have more fully debated with you before.

Add Pag. 446 'To imagine that we cannot with a good Conscience  
'be present at Assemblies, but only when we do fully and generally ap-  
'prove of all things in them, it is certainly not to know neither the use of  
'Charity, nor the Laws of Christian Society.

But what if a Church requires Ministers and Christians to *declare their*  
*Approbation* of Things they *cannot approve of*, and to *practise* that in the  
Worship of God, which (in their Judgment) *ought not to be practised*?  
Is not this a different Case? Would not this be contrary to *true Faith and*  
*Piety*? And are not such so far cut off from the Communion of that  
Church, by what he says in the beginning of that Page? That is not  
*allowable* for such to do, which yet they look upon as *tolerable* in others,  
who are otherwise perswaded in their Minds about the same.

Add P. 447. 'I cannot believe that there is any one among them that  
'looks upon your Episcopacy, or your Discipline, or certain Ceremonies which  
'you observe, as Blots and capital Errors, which hinder a Man from obtain-  
'ing Salvation. — Something was spoken to this, in the Answer to the  
*first Letter*. So I say still, they are not so well satisfied about these, as to  
give a *true Assent* unto them, and then to *declare their Assent*, would be foul  
*Dissimulation*. They know not *how easily* others get to Heaven by their  
Conformity: But if they conformed against their Consciences, they  
know not how they should ever come there *without Repentance*.

Then pag. 448. he comes to put in a good Word for us. 'I hope you  
'will not be wanting in the Duties of Charity, and the Spirit of Peace,  
'and that when the Dispute shall be only of some Temperaments, ( as  
if the Dispute had not been of these all this while ) 'Or of some Ceremo-  
'nies that are a Stumbling-block ( and yet innocent things ) and which  
'in themselves are nothing in comparison of an intire Re-union of your  
'Church under your holy Ministry, you will make it seen that you love  
'the Spouse of your Master *more than your selves*; and that it is not so  
'much from your Greatness and your Ecclesiastical Dignity that you desire  
'to receive your Glory and your Joy, as from your pastoral Vertues, and  
'the ardent care you take of your Flocks.

Now I had thought, that *all the Dispute* or Difference betwixt you,  
and the Non-conformists, had been *only about some Ceremonies*, and the like  
things; I mean, *such as in themselves are nothing in comparison of an intire*  
*and happy Union*. Were but such things removed, or no such things im-  
posed, I should hope, you would be soon united and agreed. He that  
understands not, that it is the strict and rigorous *imposing* of such things,  
(which the Imposers might lawfully take off, and we cannot lawfully  
submit to) which *keeps up the Difference* amongst us; I say, he that under-  
stands not this, and does not consider, and speaks to it, he cannot be



supposed *rightly* to consider our Case. And yet how obvious is it, that this is quite over-looked here, not once seriously debated in any of these three Letters?

And therefore, as I before *appealed* to you, as *Judg*, whether we were not misrepresented here, and you have *judged the matter* already; so I shall expect, that in the next *Impression* of this your *Impartial Account*, you will take care, these *Letters* may be left out. You cannot but know, that they were no *competent Judges* betwixt us, who had only heard *one Part*, and seem wholly ignorant what the *other Part* hath to plead for themselves. Here I remember what you say, *Preface*, pag. 35. (of one you speak of there) 'But I must do the Author that Right, to declare, that before his Death, he was very sensible of the Injury he had done to some worthy Divines, — and begged God and them pardon for it. So would I have you to do these worthy *eminent, learned Divines*, and us also *that write*, to smother their *Letters*, as soon as you can, if you do no more. Otherwise though I may not live, or have liberty to call you *partial*, the World may account you so.

And yet observing every one of them to have some touch for *Moderation, Charity, some Temperament*, and the like, *if a Council of such* as these were called, and once thorowly understood our Cause, I should not doubt of their *determining* for us. (I have respect to what you say, *Pref.* p 77.) And to come nearer to you yet, *If a Council could be called of all the Protestant Churches in Christendom* (and let any one of these be set in the Chair,) that would *indifferently bear* what *both Parts* have to say, (I would only exclude such as you, for what you say, *Rat. Acc.* p. 292. and 338. 'What Justice or Reason is there, that the Party accused, should sit *Judg* in their own Cause? None of the *Parties accused* seem fit to you, either to be *Judg*, or *Jury*, and with this Caution only) I should not distrust our Cause, if such a Council had the hearing of it.

One thing more I learn from these *Letters*, *viz.* When I see that such *eminent learned Divines* are so mistaken, and drawn to misrepresent so considerable a number of their Brethren, living in the *same Age* with them, and not very far *remote* from them; it satisfies me how much more easy it was for the *Romish Party*, being uppermost in the World; to *cloud* and obscure those, who at any time appeared against their Errors and Corruptions. As the Lord Faulkland (Answer to Mr. Montague, p. 281) If he consider the great Industry of his Church in *extinguishing those whom they have called Hereticks*, and also their Books, so that we know scarce any thing of them, but from themselves (who are too *partial to make good Historians*) if he consider how carefully they stop Men's Mouths. — But here I shall stop my Pen. So much to these Letters.

Yet for a Conclusion, I have a few Words more particularly to you. Now,

*Reverend Sir,*

Be not offended at my plainness. I hope 'tis for the Interest of the *true Protestant Religion*, that I appear in this Cause, ( how weak, and unworthy soever. ) My *Charity*, ( I speak my heart ) is not confined to a *Party*, no, not so set upon that, which you would call my own; but where I have reason to believe others of a *different Perswasion* are more holy, and live more like Christians, I would esteem, love, and honour such more. I am not conscious to my self of wishing you the least harm, or enjoying your Dignities, or Estate. Live or dye, sink or swim, however things go with me and mine, I hope, it is my Hearts desire, it may go well with the Church and People of God. I see the *Protestant Interest* in a lamentable, *tottering State*. Methinks, all that are true Friends to it should readily yield, it would stand firmer on ample Ground, ( Terms of Communion of a due latitude ) than on such a narrow Bottom, that admits not of a Multitude of sound Christians, who would be firm to it. Yet the latter of these you plead zealously for, ( though it is plain, your dividing them from you, by unnecessary, *uncatholick* Terms, must needs weaken both you, and them. ) This I cannot but be sensible of, and think it my Duty to lament.

Unless the Lord shall incline you to a more moderate Course, than you have lately taken, in reference to Dissenters, I know I may expect a fiercer Assault from you. But I know as well what Ground I stand on, and further am bold to say, you cannot hope for Success in this Cause, without first destroying a considerable part of your own Works, ( not only pulling down your *Irenicum*, a good Sconce, however now slighted; but also sadly battering and shaking that goodly Fabrick, your main Fort, the *Rational Account* too. ) And if you causelessly destroy, what you had so well built, and what is fortified and strengthened with so much Reason, will you not make your self a Transgressor? And may not this add something to the grief of your Wound ( as *Asop* has it of the Eagle ) to be shot with your own Feathers.

Yet ( *Reverend Sir* ) I would be more concerned far, on other Accounts for you. Refrain now from these Men, and let them alone; for if the Work wherein they are employed be God's Work, then you cannot seek to overthrow it, but therein you will be found a Fighter against God. Oh! be well advised what you do further this way. You may be under a sore Temptation, seeing your self so far engaged in this Cause, possibly you may think, it would be a Dishonour now to retract. But if by this Undertaking of yours,



yours, you seek to deprive very many Souls of the ordinary means of Salvation, (*forbidding us to preach to Sinners that they might be saved*); if thus you set your self in some measure to obstruct the Course of the Gospel; if you so far oppose the Interest of Christ, (your great Lord and Master) if you are against what may be truly called *God's Worship*, and truly Religious Exercises, be assured, this shall not be for your Honour in the End. For the Lord has said, *Them that honour me, I will honour; and they that despise me, shall be lightly esteemed.* And you know further, our Lord Jesus Christ hath denounced a sad *Wo* unto such as take away the Key of Knowledge from Men.

And ought you not to think seriously of it, whether you may not be accounted to have a special Hand, in procuring what further Opposition and Sufferings, your poor Brethren may meet withal? If Men should be animated, and set on by your Writings, to *fine, impoverish, imprison, &c.* them (being falsely perswaded, that in persecuting them, they should do God and his Church good Service) can you be found altogether clear in this matter?

And is it not a dangerous thing, not only to scandalize and injure a Prophet, or eminent Saint and Servant of God, but even to offend the least and weakest Believer? *Mar. 9. 42. Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, &c.* There we see, Christ makes not a light matter of it.

You may go on censuring such, as guilty of as great a Sin as Murder, when nothing but a fear of sinning keeps them from doing as you would have them. But when you have said all you can against them, and tho you will not allow them to be Members of any Church upon Earth; yet with all your Authority (was it greater) you cannot shut them out of Heaven, you cannot separate them from Christ; As P. Martyr, *Ceterum dicant quicquid velint, nunquam efficient, quin credentes & viventes ad præscriptum Verbi Dei sint felices.* The best of it is, they may be happy, for all that you can ever say, or do. Yea, though they were supposed under some Misapprehensions, as suppose Conformity lawful in it self; yet their Non-conformity, and Non-compliance with you, through a Conscientious Tenderness is better, than a rash, precipitant, or dissembling, hypocritical Conformity would be. And thus endeavouring (as near as they can) to keep to the Rule of the holy Scripture, avoiding what they cannot but suspect is not according to that Rule, they may be in a safer way, than if they were in external Communion with you. And so much I have from my Lord Faulkland too, (p. 287.) By that Rule, whosoever regulates his Life and Doctrine (or Belief) I am confident, that though he may mistake Error for Truth in the way, he shall never mistake Hell for Heaven in the End.

And yet further, should you not consider, whether it be not more agreeable to the *Revealed Will* and Mind of Christ, that you should suffer *some Tares* to grow, rather than *pluck up good Corn* with them?

Reverend Sir, It having so happened, that poor I have been called out (among others an hundred times sifter) to shew my Opinion touching the Matter you have started, I cannot but think, as I here declare (so far as my Judgment serves) you might have employed your Time, your Learning and Parts to much better purpose, than you have done in this *late Piece of Work*. Surely my Life would be but sad to me, if I could not find more pleasing Work than this, that you have been an Occasion of engaging me in. And yet I hope to have more Comfort in it, at the great day of Accounts, than I can conceive you to have of yours in that Day. If you lay the *Unity of Christians* upon Conformity too, or *Uniformity in doubtful and suspected*, if not unlawful Practices, a general Union can never be had, or hoped for. If you would make the *way to Heaven* narrower than Christ has left it, many will be forced to leave you here.

But now if you would henceforth propose and promote an Union amongst Christians upon *Catholick Terms*, we are for you, and would heartily joyn with you. And as that most learned and pious Bishop Usher (Serm. of *Univers. of the Church, and Unity of Faith*, p. 43, 44.) If at this day we should take a Survey of the several Professions of Christianity, that have any large Spread in any part of the World, — and should thinke out all those wherein they did differ one from another, and gather into one Body the rest of the Articles wherein they all did generally agree; we should find that in those Propositions, which without all Controversy are universally received in the whole Christian World, so much truth is contained as, being joyned with holy Obedience, may be sufficient to bring a Man unto everlasting Salvation. Neither have we cause to doubt, but that as many as do walk according to this Rule, — Peace shall be upon them, and Mercy, and upon the Israel of God. Now therefore do, as he says, ( *ibid.* p. 18. ) We for our parts dare not abridg this Grant, and limit this great Lordship, as we conceive it may best fit our own turns; but leave it to his own Latitude, and seek for the Catholick Church, neither in this Part nor in that Piece, but among all that in every place call upon the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours.

And if a Zeal for such a general Comprehension, and happy Union of Christians will ( to use the Words of Mr. de L'Angle, p. 424. ) 'bring down a thousand Blessings of Heaven and Earth upon those that shall contribute the most unto it, resolve now, and henceforward to put forth your self this way; Put in for your share of Blessings.

I remember, I concluded my former writing with a Collect borrowed from you. Here I would say Amen to that Prayer, with which Dr. Potter shuts



up his *Answer to Charity mistaken*, [ That it would please the Father of Mercies to take away out of his Church all Dissention and Discord; all Heresies and Schisms, all Abuses and false Doctrines, all Idolatry, Superstition and Tyranny; and to unite all Christians in one holy Bond of Truth and Peace, Faith and Charity; that so with one Mind and one Mouth, we may all joyn in his Service,— ] I add no more, but that the Father of Lights would so direct your Studies, and Course, that you may do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth; which is the Prayer of,

Reverend Sir,

Your humble and  
faithful Servant,

John Barrett.

I more wish, than hope, that of these sad Controversies here will be,

The End.

*Proper Materials drawn from the true and  
only way of Concord, &c.*

QUERY I.

**W**Hether the Apostle *Paul* hath not clearly and fully decided the case, against censuring or despising one another for things Indifferent? *Rom. 14, & 15.* And if Men will not understand, nor stand to that Decision, whether it should be any wonder, if they will not understand, or be satisfied with our most cogent Arguments? [*Second Plea for Peace. p. 169. § 75.*]

Whether they that say, the Apostle doth not forbid such Impositions there, can see Day for Light? 1. Doth he not forbid censuring, despising, and not receiving one another; and command Dissenters to receive one another? And then must he not forbid such Imposition as is inconsistent herewith? 2. Doth he not direct this Command to all the Church of *Rome*, even to the authorized Pastors and Rulers of the Church, as well as to the People? 3. Was he not a Pastor and Ruler of that Church as fully authorized as any that should succeed? 4. Is not this Scripture (as others) written for a standing Rule, and so obligatory to Rulers still? [*ib. p. 170. § 77.*] Did not the Apostle speak here by Divine Authority? Are not his Words recorded here, part of Christ's Law indited by the Spirit? And may we think, that any that come after him, or to whom he wrote, should have power to contradict or obliterate the same? [*Way of Concord, p. 152.*] 5. Do not his Reasons touch the case of all Churches in all Ages, and not only some particular Persons, and Case? As he argueth from the difference betwixt well-meaning Christians as weak, and strong, as doubting, and as assured, as mistaken, and as in the right, &c. If such weak, mistaken Christians in such matters ever have been, and ever will be in the Church upon Earth, doth not the reason from their case and necessity still hold? 6. How many great and pressing moral Reasons (that all Christians are bound by) are heaped up here? Does he not argue, 1. From Christian love to Brethren, 2. From human Compassion to the Weak. 3. From God's own Example, who receiveth such, whom there-



fore we must not reject. 4. From God's Prerogative to judg, and our having no such judging power in such cases. 5. From God's Propriety in his own Servants. 6. From God's Love and Mercy that will uphold such. 7. Because what Men do as to please God, must not be condemned without necessity, but an holy Intention cherished, so it be not in forbidden things. 8. Because Men must not go against Conscience in indifferent things. 9. From Christ's dreadful Judgment which is near, and which we our selves must undergo. 10. From the Sin of laying Stumbling-blocks, and occasions of Offence. 11. From the danger of crossing the end of Christ's Death, destroying Souls for whom he died. 12. Because it will make our Good to be ill spoken of. 13. Because the *Kingdom of God*, or Constitution of Christianity, and the Church, lieth in no such Matters, but in *Righteousness, and Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghost*. 14. Because *Christ is pleased* in this without the other, and *God accepteth* such. 15. Because such are *approved of Men*, ( i. e. ) This Righteousness, Peace, and holy Joy, without Agreement in such Ceremonies and By-matters, beareth its own Testimony for Approbation to the Judgment of all impartial Men; Humanity and Christianity teach us to love and honour such. 16. From our common Obligation to *live in Peace with all*. 17. From our Obligation to *do all* to the *edifying of one another*. 18. Because *God's Work* else is *destroyed* by us. 19. Because our own lawful Acts are turned into *Sin* when they *hurt another*, and from the Obligation that lieth on us to deny our own *Liberty in Meat, &c.* to avoid the hurting of another that is weak. 20. From the *Damnation* of such as are driven or drawn to act doubtingly. 21. From the special Duty and Mercy of the Strong that should bear the Infirmities of the Weak. 22. From the Example of Christ himself, that *pleased not himself*, and our great Obligation to imitate Christ. 23. From God's Patience to us. 24. Because indeed this is the true way to *Love and Unity*, that *with one Mind and one Mouth we may glorify God*, while we lay not our Concord on impossible Terms. 25. Because *Christ receiveth* us, and it is to *God's Glory, &c.* Whether do all these moral Arguments signify no more than this, *receive and tolerate such only till you make Laws against them*? [ *ibid.* p. 150, 151, 152. ]

*Query*, 2. Whether Men have any Authority to make Laws about God's Worship; but what Christ hath given them? [ *Second Plea for Peace*, p. 28. §. 36. ] And whether it be not against the Mind and Law of Christ ( declared Act. 15. 28. ) that unnecessary Laws and Burthens in Religion should be made for, and laid upon the Churches? [ *ibid.* p. 29. §. 40. ] So whether that Determination and Decree of the holy Ghost by the Apostles be not obligatory to all Rulers and Churches upon Earth, even to this day? And whether all that think not themselves wiser, should not confess

confess that at least it is safe to follow it? [*ibid.* p. 169. §. 74.] If therefore the Pastors shall contrary to that Decree, impose unnecessary things on the Church, not only under the Obligation of Duty, but as a necessary Condition of Church-Communion, whether this be not a tyrannizing over God's Heritage, and usurping a Power never given them? [*ibid.* p. 155. §. 33.]

2. 3. Whether what God hath left to human Prudence to determine concerning Churches and Church-affairs, be not thus limited by his general Laws, viz. That all things be done to Edification (the Circumstances fitted to the end, the Glory of God and the publick Good, the promoting of Truth and Godliness,) that all be done in Love, to the promoting of Love and Unity; and that all be done in order and decently; and as may avoid Offence or Scandal to all, both those without, and those within? [*First Plea for Peace*, p. 19.] Then query,

1. Whether they do well, that unnecessarily bring Subjects into such a Strait, by needless Laws, for Additions in Religion, that the Consciences of Men fearing God must unavoidably be perplexed between a Fear of Treason and Disobedience against Christ, and of Disobedience to their Prince or Pastors? [*Second Plea*, &c. p. 28. §. 38.]

2. Whether it be not more inexcusable to rack and divide the Church by unnecessary Additions in Religion? [*ibid.* §. 39.]

3. Whether it be not against the Will and Law of Christ, to use things otherwise indifferent, scandalously or temptingly, to the ensnaring and endangering of Men's Souls, and the Dishonour of Religion? (*Rom.* 14, & 15. 1 *Cor.* 8.) And whether Men may make Laws about Religion, enjoyning such an evil use of such things? [*ibid.* p. 29. §. 41.]

4. Whether to invent and command new publick-Worship-Ordinances (either in God's Name or their own) co-ordinate, or of the same kind with God's own Worship-Ordinances, which have no peculiar usefulness to one Age or People more than to another, nor any new Reason for them, but what was extant at the making of God's Laws, (whether this) seemeth not to be an Accusation of Christ's Laws of Omission and Defectiveness, and an Usurpation of his Legislative Power? [*ibid.* §. 42.]

5. Whether to forbid Baptism, or to alter it, or make a new Sacrament of Admission, or a new consecrating, or dedicating Symbol for the Solemnization of our Covenant with God, and a new Symbol of the Christian Church, or visible Badge of Christianity, seem not an Usurpation, and Accusation of God's Law, as insufficient? [*ibid.* p. 30. §. 46.]

6. Whether to forbid Preaching, or Prayer or Praise, ordaining Homogeneous Means of our own, seem not an Usurpation, and unlawful? [*ibid.* p. 31. §. 47.]

7. Whe-



7. Whether to add more Doctrines, or Articles of Faith, which God hath not revealed in Nature or Scripture, and to require Belief or Profession of Belief of the same, as to any religious End, seem not an Usurpation, and unjust Accusation of God's Word, as insufficient? [*ibid.* p. 29. §. 43.]

8. Whether to alter the Qualifications of Church-members; either forbidding those that Christ requires us to receive, or receiving such as Christ forbiddeth us to receive, be not to contradict his Laws by Usurpation, whether Magistrates, or Pastors do it? [*ibid.* p. 30. §. 45.]

9. Whether to alter the Qualifications of Christ's Ministers, or the nature of their Office, and invent new co-ordinate Officers, seemeth not Usurpation? [*ibid.* p. 31. §. 48.]

10. Whether to overthrow, or prohibit Christ's Church-Discipline, or to set up another (that is not merely subordinate to it, modally to promote it) seem not an Usurpation? [*ibid.* §. 51.]

11. Whether to forbid Religious Assemblies, or alter their Ends and principal Use, be not to usurp, and to contradict the Laws of Christ? [*ibid.* p. 29. §. 44.]

Q. 4. Whether Rulers ought not to prefer Christ's Interest before their own, and account that their own lieth in preferring His; and should not value conscionable upright Men, though Dissenters in tolerable Cases, and not encourage their unconscionable Enemies? [*Way of Concord*, 3d part, p. 26.] And whether the chief Work of Rulers be not to promote the keeping of God's Laws, and the everlasting Good of Men, and the temporal Good in order thereunto? [*Second Plea for Peace*, p. 108. col. 1. §. 11.] And whether Rulers may command any thing, which will notably do more Harm than Good; or make an unnecessary thing a Means or Occasion of excluding the necessary Worship of God, or preaching of his Gospel [*Judgment of Non-conformists*, in *second Plea*, &c. p. 76. §. 59.] And whether is it more to common Good, and the Interest of Honesty and Conscience, that all the Persons in a Nation be imprisoned, banished, or killed, that dare not swear, say and practise all that is imposed on them, than that unnecessary Impositions be altered, or forborn [*Way of Concord*, 3d Part, p. 111, 112.]

Q. 5. Though Magistrates may regulate us in the Circumstances of those Duties, which the Law of Nature or Gospel doth command; yet if on such Pretence they violate, or contradict either the Law of Nature, or the Gospel, and destroy the Duty it self, or its End, whether we are bound in such Cases to obey them? Or whether it be not enough that we patiently suffer? [*First Plea for P.* p. 104.]

Q. 6. Whether the Kings of *Israel* had Power to forbid the Priests exercising their Office according to God's Law? Or, whether they could change or abrogate their Office? [*ibid.* p. 20.] Of *Solomon's* putting out *Abiathar*, see (p. 21.) Whether might they then have put out a lawful Priest, that had not forfeited his Life, or Office? Or might they have put any one in his Place, that had not Right from God, or that was unqualified? Or might they have forbidden the Priests the Work appointed them by God? [*ibid.* p. 22.]

Q. 7. Whether such as Christ's Laws empower to ordain others to the Work of the Ministry, have Power from Christ to hinder the Ordination of such as Christ's Laws admit into the Ministry? [*ibid.* p. 25.]

Q. 8. Whether the Magistrate ( besides the Power of the Temples and Tithes, and publick Maintenance and Liberty also ) hath the Power of Ordination, or Degradation, that no Man may be a true Minister without, or contrary to his Consent? [*Sacrileg. Desert.* p. 11.] Whether were not many of the *Non-conformist's* true Pastors of their several Flocks, before they were silenced, and cast out? [*ibid.*] And whether did the ejecting them from the Temples and Tithes degrade them, or make them no Pastors to their Flocks? ( Though Prudence may require Minister and People to consent to a Dissolution of such a Relation, when they cannot hold it without greater hurt than benefit. ) [*ibid.*]

Q. 9. Though Princes or Patrons may. 1. Offer meet Pastors to the Ordainers and Consenters to be accepted, when there is just Cause for their Interposition. 2. And may hinder both Ordainers and People from introducing intolerable Men. 3. And when a Peoples Ignorance, Wilfulness, Faction, or Division makes them refuse all that are truly fit for them, may urge them to accept the best, and may possess such of the Temples, and publick Maintenance, and make it consequently to become the Peoples Duty to consent; Yet whether Christ and his Apostles have not settled the Right of Ordination on the Senior Pastors or Bishops, and the Right of consenting in the People? [*First Plea for P.p.* 33.] And whether any Man can be the Pastor of a Church *de jure*, or truly *de facto*, against the Church, or Peoples Will, or without their Consent? [*ibid.* p. 25.] As the Saying of *Cyprian* is well known, that [ the People have the greatest Power both to chuse a worthy Priest, and to refuse, or forsake the unworthy, *ibid.* p. 77. ] And when in *England* it belongeth, 1. To the Patron to present. 2. To the Bishop to ordain and institute, and therefore to approve and invest. 3. To the People *Jure Divino*, to be free Consenters, 4. And to the Magistrate to protect, and judg who shall be protected or tolerated under him; if these four Parties be for four Ministers, or for three, or two several Men, and cannot agree in one, Whether the culpable



ble Dissenters will not be the Causes of Schism? [*ibid.* p. 50.]

Q. 10. Whether the Churches and Councils were in the right, or no, which for 700, yea 1000 Years held that the calling of a Bishop was null, that had not the Clergies Election, and the Peoples Election or Consent? And if Usurpers should thrust out the Bishops and Conformists, and make themselves our Pastors against our Wills, what would the Bishops think of such? Would they hold it unlawful to separate from such, agreeing with them in Doctrine and Worship. [*Ans. to Dr. Stil. Sermon. p. 27.*]

Q. 11. If a lawful Magistrate, or Prince put in place of Pastors, Persons of untried and suspected parts of Fidelity, Whether will his Imposition make such the true Pastors of that Church before and without the Peoples Consent? [*First Plea for P. p. 55.*] If so, then whether might not one Roman Emperour have undone all the Churches and Souls in the Empire in a great Degree, by imposing on them insufficient, heretical, or malignant Pastors? [*ibid.* p. 56.] If People were as much under Princes for chusing Guides for their Souls, as a Daughter in her Fathers House is under her Father for the choice of an Husband (which yet we have not seen proved) yet as he can be no Husband to her, without her Consent, (though She culpably deny Consent, Query, Whether it be not so here, that they can be no Pastors to People, till they consent? [*Way of Concord. p. 209. §. 18.*]) But whether hath God authorized the Magistrate to chuse what Persons every Man in his Dominions shall entrust his Soul to, as the Pastor, whose Conduct he is bound in Conscience to obey? (*Ans. to Dr. Stil. Sermon. p. 14.*)

Whether shall the People have any Judgment of discerning, or not? If yea, must not the Bounds of it be shewed, without denying the thing, (as if that would bring in all Confusion?) If Usurpers claim the Crown, must not Subjects judg which is the true King, and defend his Right? Will any say, if the People be Judges, they may set up Usurpers, and put down the King? When they are but Discerners of that which is before their Duty, and have no Right to err, or alter the Law and Right, can any dreadful Consequence be proved to follow on it? Or if it be otherwise, must they not be ruled as Brutes? and so must not judg so much as whom they are to obey? Is there any Christian that dare say, that Bishops or Princes are in all things to be obeyed, lest the People be made Judges? (*First Plea for P. p. 70, 71.*)

Q. 12. Whether the Ministerial Office be taken up upon Tryal, or for a time; or during Life (with a Capacity to perform the work?) If the latter be granted, then whether it be any less, than, 1. Horrid Sacriledg, 2. Perfidious Covenant-breaking, 3. Disobedience to God, 4. Cruelty to Souls.

Souls, 5. And unthankfulness for great Mercies, if any of us shall desert our undertaken Office (yea, tho a silencing *Diocesan* should forbid us the exercise of it, unjustly? *Sacrileg. Desert. p. 25, 30.*)

Q. 13. If Rulers may silence the faithful Ministers of Christ, who knoweth where to bound his Obedience to such Silencers? If a 1000 or 2000 faithful Ministers must cease Preaching, when so forbidden, why not 3000? why not 4000? If half a Kingdom; can you satisfy the Consciences of the other half, that they must not do so too; and so all Christian Kingdoms conform to *Muscovy*, when the Prince commandeth it? And if a 1000 or 2000 or 3000 Parishes must chuse the apparent hazard of their Souls, and refuse such helps as Experience certifieth us they greatly need, in Obedience to Man, why must not the rest of the Parishes do so also? May I give away the needful helps to my Salvation, because others have them? should their Salvation satisfy me instead of mine own? [*First Plea for Peace, p. 89, 90.*] Whether should Men persuade the poor to famish, rather than against Law to beg; because if thousands of them dye of Famine, yet other People are supplied? [*ib. p. 102.*]

Q. 14. Whether the antient Christian Pastors preached not against the Will of Princes for 300 years; and after that against the Will of Christian Princes (as *Constantius, Valens, Theodosius junior, Valentinian, &c.*) And whether not only Apostles said, that God was to be obeyed rather than Men; but such as *Timothy* (who was ordained by Man) were not strictly charged before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who will judge the living and dead at his appearing, and Kingdom, to preach the Gospel, and be instant in season, &c. [*ib. p. 226, 227.*]

Q. 15. Whether any Man hath Authority to forbid a Faithful Minister of Christ, who forfeiteth not his Office-Power, to perform the Office to which he is ordained? And whether such remain not under a Divine Obligation, which Man's Law cannot dissolve? Whether it be not right, as Bishop *Bilson* saith, [If Princes forbid us, we must go on with our work?] What if an Interdict silence all the Ministers in a Kingdom? Must all obey? What if it silence more than can be spared without the Churches wrong? And whose Laws be they, that would so bind? Is it Infidel Princes or only Christians? Is it Papists, &c. or only the Orthodox? Must God ask leave of Rulers to be worshipped as God? Hath God made Men Judges whether the Gospel shall be preached or not; or whether People shall be Saved, or left to perish in their Ignorance and Sin? And how cometh the Orthodox to be authorized to do Mischief, or to forbid the needful preaching of the Gospel, any more than an Heretick? or a Christian more than an Heathen? Is he not bound to do more good than they, rather than authorized to do more hurt? [*Ans. to Dr. Stil. Sermon. p. 84, 85. or 78, 79.*]

See also p. 21.



Q. 16. Where such Sins are made the condition of Ministration by Men in Power, as that all the whole Ministry of a Kingdom are bound in Conscience to deny Consent and Conformity thereto, Whether is it not the duty of all the Ministry *in primo instanti* to forbear their Ministerial Office, or of none, (the Reason being the same to all?) Now if all these must forbear or lay down their Office, because forbidden by Men to exercise it, then is it not in the Power of a Prince to cast out Christianity when he pleaseth, and to deny God all publick Worship? And must we not then ask leave of Rulers, that Christ may be Christ, and Souls may be saved; (as if the Keys of Heaven and Hell were theirs?) [*First Plea for Peace*, p. 114, 115.] But whether must not all agree, that to silence all the Ministers of the Nation, is a thing that God hath not given any Man authority to do; because of the necessity of their Ministry: and consequently to silence any necessary Ministry at all? [*ib.* p. 223.] And if all must not lay down their Ministry, why must a 1000 or 2000 do it rather than all the rest? If it be said, the rest are a competent supply to the Churches; how shall we be sure that other Mens sinning will absolve the Innocent from their Duty? (As if I were bound to be a Minister only till other Men will Sin.) And where can the Wit of Man ever set Bounds as to this Matter? Will it not be granted, that if the most in *France* conform to Popery, this will not disoblige all others from the exercise of their Ministry? And who then can say, what those Untruths and Sins are, which a weak and erring Ministry may be guilty of, which shall serve to disoblige the rest? And were not this an easy way to introduce any Error, by forbidding any but the Defenders of it to Preach? [*Ib.* p. 115, 116.]

Q. 17. Whether God hath authorized the Magistrate to chuse and command in what Words only every Pastor shall publicly pray to God, and what Books and Words of Men he shall profess Assent and Consent to, and what dedicating Symbols of Christianity he shall use as engaging in the Christian Covenant; and to command Ceremonies and Modes for Dissent wherein he shall deny Baptism and Church-Communion to all Dissenters, tho the things be taken to be indifferent by the Magistrate, and great Sins by the Dissenters? [*Answer to Dr. Stil. Sermon*, p. 14.]

Q. 18. Whether Pastors usurp not Power over one another, when they command all about them to speak to Men from God, or to God from Men in no other Words, but what they (the Uturpers) shall write them down, making Ministers but Cryers to read their Prescripts and Proclamations? [*Second Plea*, &c. p. 142.]

Q. 19. Whether any but Volunteers should be taken for true Christians, or admitted to Holy Communion, to receive the Seals of Pardon and Life? [*Way of Concord, third Part*, p. 27. §. 7.] And whether Pastors of the Churches

Churches should be constrained to administer Sacraments to any against their Consciences? Whether it be not their Office to be Judges, who is to be baptized, and to communicate? [*Ib.* p. 123.]

Q. 20. If any be urged to take a Re-ordination against their Judgments, whether Morals must not be preferred before Rituals, and Rituals never set against them? And whether they should not be of this Mind, that deny the Scriptures to have unchangeably fixed all Rituals; and yet confess that Morals are fixedly determined? [*Ib.* p. 214, 215.] Is it not contrary to the temper of the Gospel, which ever subiecteth Ceremonies, Rites and External Orders, to Morals, and to Man's Good, and the great Ends? [*Ib.* third Part, p. 81.]

Q. 21. When the most learned, sober, judicious Conformists, differ not at all from us about the Matter it self, to which we deny Conformity; but confess it to be unlawful (as to the hardest Points of the imposed Subscriptions, Oaths, Declarations, and Covenants) and only take the Words in such a Sence, in which we our selves could take them, were we persuaded that it was indeed the true meaning of them; Query hereupon, How it comes to pass that they, (who are as much as we against that Sence which we disown, and agree with us in the Matter) should deserve Liberty, Honour and Preferment, for otherwise interpreting the Words of the Law, which the Lawgivers themselves will not interpret; when our Supposition, that the Law-makers mean properly as they speak, is taken to deserve Scorn, Silencing, &c. from them that will not expound their Words to us? [*Judgment of Non-conformists in Second Plea, &c.* p. 116, 117.] And seeing (as those worthy Conformists must grant) that if the Words of the Laws be properly to be understood, and not with their Limitations, then the Conformists are in the wrong, and the Non-conformists in the right; whether it be not Justice to tell the World, and write it on our Cross, that we are silenced, &c. because we dare not take Oaths and Covenants imposed in Terms excluding Limitations and Exceptions, in a limited, excepting Sence, without the Explication of the Law-makers? [*Ib.* p. 120, 121.]

Q. 22. Suppose the Sin were on the silenced Ministers part, yet if their Errour be in a small and difficult Matter, not deserving silencing (as theirs, *Rom.* 14. about Meats and Days, &c.) whether it may not be a far greater Sin, and Schism in the Silencers, than in them? [*First Plea for Peace,* p. 116.] Tho the Magistrate ought to silence all Preachers, that after due Admonition, so grossly misbehave themselves in Doctrine, Worship, or Conversation, as to be the Plagues of the Churches, and to do apparently more hurt than good; yet as to all worthy and able Ministers, if they commit any Fault, whether they should not be punished only as other Subjects, with such Penalties, as shall not by silencing or



restraint, be a Punishment to the Peoples Souls, nor hinder the preaching of the Gospel of Salvation? Even as if the common Bakers, Brewers, Butchers, Carpenters perform their Work perniciously (poysoning their Bread, Beer, Meat, &c.) they should be forbidden their Trade: but should they for other Faults be so punished, that the People be left without Bread, Beer, Meat, and Houses for their Faults? [*Moral Prognostication*, p. 55. § 32.] Are there no fitter means than silencing, to correct such Ministers? Is it not a Sin to silence them, when their Ministry is needful [*Ans. to Dr. Stil. Serm.* p. 20, 21.] Had Images been lawfully used in Places, or Exercises of God's Worship; yet whether was it not Inhuman, and Unchristian in those Bishops and Councils, who cursed from Christ all that were of a contrary Mind, and ejected, and silenced the Dissenters? [*Way of Concord*, p. 89. § 25.]

Q. 23. Whether do Men take it to be a Sin, to suffer us to preach the Gospel, and a greater Sin than to suffer the Inundation of Infidelity, Popery and the rest, which they say is ready to break in upon us? Or whether do they judg our not Subscribing, Swearing, &c. so great a Sin in us, that the Punishment laid on Swearers, Drunkards, or Fornicators, will not serve turn to avenge it on our selves, nor any other of our personal Sufferings; unless the Souls of many 1000's, and the Protestant Religion, and our Posterity also suffer for it? [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 138, 139.]

Q. 24. Whether Magistrates, and Pastors must not distinguish of Errors and Faults of Subjects? whether some are not tolerable, and therefore to be tolerated; and some intolerable, and therefore not to be tolerated? Whether they that cry out, [One, and All, why not one as well as another?] will say, If a Foot must be cut off for a Gangreen, why not for a Corn? [*Second Plea for Peace*, p. 162. § 49.]

Q. 25. Whether he that knows himself to be a Man, and a Sinner, and is penitently conscious what abundance of greater Sins he hath than the conscientious Forbearance of a Ceremony, or needless Oath, or Subscription, will not be very tender of his usage of others for such Matters? [*ib.* p. 163. § 52.]

Q. 26. Whether a tender Conscience be not the same with what God hath promised, even an Heart of Flesh, a Conscience that hath Spiritual Life and Feeling, and is sensible of the evil of the least Sin? [*ib.* p. 163, 164. § 54.] And whether the imposing of unnecessary Subscriptions, Professions, or Oaths, be not the way to fill the Church with Men that are not troubled with tender Consciences, and that have no fear of God, or Sin? And whether he that believeth, that ever he shall be judged by the great Pastor of the Flock, should not be as much at least afraid of letting

letting in such Presbyters into the Church, as of enduring holy faithful Men, that fear a Lie, or Oath, or Superstition? [*Ib.* p. 164. § 55.]

Q. 27. Whether every Man hath not Sins of Ignorance, and some degree of Error? And whether have not some Faithful Men more than others? And do they not take some Sins to be Duties, or no Sins? [*Way of Concord*, p. 181.] And whether he that maketh a Canon to Silence, or Excommunicate, or cast out Men for a Fault common to all Preachers, Christians and Men, doth not make a Canon to Silence or cast out all Preachers, Pastors, and Men? And if we deserve to be cast out of the Church and Kingdom in the case of Non-conformity to the present Impositions, whether it be not either because we are weak, or ignorant, or wicked? And whether we may not here profess to the World our joyful consent to be silenced and banished, on condition that the *Diocesans* will effectually provide, that none more Weak, more Ignorant, and more Wicked, shall be tolerated in Church and Kingdom when we are gone, and that no detriment shall betail his Majesties Dominions by the diminution of his Subjects? [*Second Plea for Peace*, p. 164, 165. § 57, 58.]

Q. 28. Whether a diversity of Circumstances and indifferent Modes in divers Churches or Parishes, and sometimes in the same Church, be such a dreadful Mischief, as some frightful Pastors would make themselves and others believe? Or whether it be to be compared with the consequents of unnecessary Impositions? [*Second Plea for Peace*, p. 158. § 44.]

Q. 29. Whether was there no difference in their Forms or Modes of Worship, between *Basil at Casarea*, and the Church at *Neocaesarea*; and between *Rome* and *Millane*; and between almost all the Catholick Bishops for many hundred years? And whether is there not so now, one Parish-Minister praying freely in the Pulpit before and after Sermons; another by a Form; a third bidding Prayer before, &c. [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 34.] And is not difference in many points of Doctrine as great a difference, as using and not using some of the Liturgick Forms and Ceremonies? [*Ans. to Dr. Stil. Serm.* p. 46, or 48.]

Q. 30. Whether the present full Conformity required, will ever be the Terms of the full desirable Unity and Concord of the Christian Protestants in his Majesties Dominions? Whether it be not morally impossible to bring all good Christians Judgments to hold all this Conformity lawful? And whether it be not as impossible to bring them all to conform to that which they judg unlawful? [*Second Plea for Peace*, p. 172. § 80.] Whether there is a greater difference of Visages, than of Intellectual Apprehensions? [*Way of Concord*, p. 81.] And while there will be difference in Judgment (even among Christians, and good and tolerable Christians) whether can other be expected, than that there will be also difference in Professions, and



in Practice? Will not honest Mens Professions and Practices agree in the main with their Judgments? Whether then is it to be expected, that if some Men think that long doctrinal Confessions, formed in Men's private Words, or Liturgies, or other humane Forms have nothing in them untrue, or evil, or which all Men may not consent to, therefore all others must think so too, and say as they? Who can think that in many thousand uncertain Words, all Men can and must be of the same Mind, and approve them all alike? Or that honest Men can lye, and say that they assent to what they do not? (*ibid.* p. 88.)

Q. 31. If Men in all these must be brought to Uniformity and Practising in the same Mode, whether must it not be either by Argument and Persuasion, or by Force? And whether it be not certain, that the first will never do it? Besides a multitude of Reasons, whether doth not many hundred Years experience prove, that all Christians will never be in all things of a mind about lawful and unlawful, Duty and Sin? And whether it be not as certain, that Force will never do it? Will a sound Believer sell his Soul to save his Flesh, or hazard Heaven by wilful Sin to save his Interest on Earth? (*ibid.* p. 89, 90.)

Q. 32. Whether in regard of the diversity of mental Capacities and Apprehensions, the best will ever agree in any, but few, plain, and certain things? (*Way of Concord*, 3d Part, p. 109.) And,

Q. 33. Whether universal Concord may not take in most of the differing Parties, though not as such, by receiving any of their Errors; yet as Christians, who agree in the common Essentials of Faith and Piety? And whether we should not hold essential Unity with all that hold the Essentials of Christianity; though with those that hold Integrals more purely, we are to have more full and nearer Concord than the rest, that have more Errors? (*ib.* p. 72.) Whether Christians ought not to bear with one another (without having their Affections alienated from, and much more without persecuting one another) in greater Matters than most of the dissenting Parties disagree in? Whether Christians of as different Principles may not, yea, and ought not yet to love each other, and live in Peace? (*Sacril. Desert.* p. 7, 8, 9.) Whether the *Novatians* for many Ages were not tolerated by the wisest and godliest Emperours and Bishops? (*ibid.* p. 14.)

Q. 34. Whether the Terms of Church-Communion must not be such as take in all that Christ taketh in, and would have us take in, (*i. e.*) All that are fit for Church-Communion? And whether they should not be such Terms as all true Christians (fit for such Church-Communion) if imposed, would have united in, in all Ages and Places of the Church since the days of Christ till now? And whether those Terms that would have divided the Church, are fit means to unite it? Or can we think that

that the Church should now unite upon such Terms, as it never united before? (*Second Plea for P. p. 152, 153.*)

Q. 35. Whether Christ himself hath not instituted the Baptismal Covenant (*Mat. 28. 19.*) to be the Title of visible Members of the Church, and the Symbol by which they shall be notified? and hath not commanded all the baptized, as Christians, to love each other as themselves; and though weak in Faith, to receive one another, as Christ receiveth us, but not to doubtful Disputations, and so far as they have attained, to walk by the same Rule (of Love and Peace) and not to despise or judge each other for tolerable Differences? And whether any mortal Man hath Power to abrogate these Terms of Church-union and Concord which Christ hath made? (*First Plea for P. p. 34.*)

Q. 36. Whether Christ, who made the Baptismal Covenant, the Test and standing Terms of Entrance, did set up Pastors over his Churches, to make new and stricter Terms and Laws; or to preserve Concord on the Terms that he had founded it, and to see that Men lived in Unity and Piety according to the Terms of the Covenant, which they had entered? (*Second Plea for P. p. 154.*) And when they have as Ministers, not as Lords, received Men on Christ's Terms, whether they may excommunicate and turn them out again for want of more, or only for violating these? (*ibid. p. 155.*)

Q. 37. Whether it be not a strange Contrariety of some to themselves, who judge that all Infants of Heathens, Jews, Turks, or wicked Men, are without Exception to be taken into the Church, if any ignorant Christian will but offer them, and say over a few Words; and the Adult also, if they can but say over the Creed by rote, and a few Words more, (that would fill the Church with Enemies of Christ;) and yet when Men are in, deny them Communion, unless they will strictly come up to many humane unnecessary Impositions; as if far stricter Obedience to Men (perhaps in Usurpations) was necessary, than to Jesus Christ? (*Way of Concord, p. 118. §. 10.*)

Q. 38. Whether the universal Church had not Unity long upon the Terms of Baptism and the Creed and Scriptures, without any other Subscriptions, Oaths, or other Professions made necessary to Communion? And whether it ever had Union upon such additional Terms of new Professions, Subscriptions and Oaths, as most Churches now impose and require? Whether they departed not from Unity and Concord (and so continue divided to this day) when they departed from the antient Simplicity, and the primitive Terms? (*ibid. p. 157. §. 42.*) And whether those Pastors who will make Canons, that all *English* Protestants shall agree in Subscriptions, Professions, Oaths, Forms and Ceremonies which they



they are not agreed in, nor ever will be; do not in effect say, we will break them more in pieces, and set them farther from each other than before? (*ibid.* p. 183. §. 100.) Whether the hereticating and cursing Men for doubtful Words, or want of Skill in aptness of Expressions, yea, or for Errors which consist with having Faith in Christ, be not so far from being a means of the Churches Good, that it hath been the grand Engine of Satan, to exercise Tyranny, excite Hatred and Schism, &c. and therefore carefully to be avoided? (*Way of Concord* p. 195. §. 34.) whether anathematizing Men for doubtful Actions, or for such Faults as consist with true Christianity and continued Subjection to Jesus Christ, be not a sinful Church-dividing Means? (*ibid.* p. 195, 196.)

Q. 39. Whether Addition to Christ's Terms be not very perilous, as well as Diminution; as, when Men will deny Church-entrance, or Communion to any that Christ would have received, because they come not up to certain Terms, which they, or such as they, devise? And though they think, that Christ giveth them Power to do thus; yet whether their Error will make them guiltless? Or whether, imputing their Error to Christ untruly, be not an Aggravation of the Sin? (*ibid.* p. 119. §. 1.) Whether it is a small Fault to usurp a Power proper to Christ? (*ibid.* §. 2.) Whether it be not dangerous Pride to think themselves great enough, wise enough, and good enough, to come after Christ, and to amend his Work? (*ibid.* §. 3.) And whether this imply not an Accusation against him, and his Institutions? (*ibid.* §. 4.) And whether the merciful Lord and Saviour of the Church, that came to take off heavy Burthens and intolerable Yokes, will take it well to have Men come after him, and as by his Authority, to make his easy Yoke more strait, and his light Burthen heavy, and to cast or keep out those that he hath redeemed and doth receive, and to deal cruelly with those that he hath so dearly bought, and so tenderly loveth? (*ibid.* p. 120. §. 6.) When Christ says, *Mat.* 18. 6. *Whoso shall offend one of these little Ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a Millstone were hanged about his Neck, &c.* Whether Bishops may curse such from Christ, and excommunicate them? And whether it be safe for them to do so? (*ibid.* p. 144.) And seeing that spiritual Privileges excell temporal, whether it be not an aggravated Tyranny to deprive Christ's Servants of Benefits so precious, and so dearly bought? (*ibid.* p. 120. §. 9.)

Q. 40. Whether Christ be not the Institutor of the Church, and hath not himself made Laws which are sufficient to be at least the Bond of their Unity; yea, for more than Essentials, even the Integrals, and many Accidents? and hath not he given Laws to regulate all Men's Laws that determine of needful undetermined Accidents? And whether any Man should be cut-off from the Church, or taken as separated, that breaketh no Law

Law of God, necessary to Church-Unity and Communion? And whether the grand Schismatics of the World are not the Engineers that fabricate needles, impossible, dividing Terms and Conditions of Unity and Communion? (*Ans. to Dr. Sill. Ser. p. 88, or 82.*)

Q. 41. Whether it be not enough, that we are united and agreed with those that differ from us, in more than Circumstances: and that we will hold Concord with all in Faith, Love, and Communion; (if they will admit us without our sinning) upon the Terms set down by the Holy Ghost and the Apostles, *Acts 15. 28*? And if no Men must be of the same Church or Kingdom, that have any difference; yea, as great as can reasonably be supposed in the meer Non-conformists, whether any two Men can be of the same Church, or Kingdom, except you will compose it of such as hold nothing unlawful, and consequently nothing morally good, which is no Church? [*Judgment of Non-conformists in second Plea for Peace, p. 85, 86.*]

Q. 42. Whether the long and sad Experience of all the Christian Churches, which have been divided by unnecessary human Impositions, and the Voice of all wise Peace-makers in all times, who have still called for [*Unity in things necessary, Liberty in things unnecessary, and Charity in both*] do not leave those that yet will not be perswaded to these Terms, as inexcusable Persons as almost any in the World; worse than those Physicians, that would use all those things as the only Remedies, which have killed all that ever took them? [*Second Plea for Peace, p. 155. § 34.*]

Q. 43. Whether they that confess, that for the Communion of all the Churches, there are no Terms like these now mentioned, should be more cruel to their own at home, turning them out of their Father's House for every Ceremonial Difference? Whether a Pastor should not love his own Flock, as well as the People of a Forreign Land? [*Ib. p. 155, 156. § 35.*] And whether it be not a Schismatical Opinion, that tho Churches of many Kingdoms may charitably differ in Ceremonies and indifferent things; yet none in the same Kingdom should be suffered so to differ? Whether the Apostle *Paul* gave not the Pastors and People of the same Church of *Rome* those Precepts of forbearing and receiving Dissenters in things indifferent? [*Way of Concord third Part, p. 106.*]

Q. 44. Whether Uniformity in Circumstantials, and in External Polity, be any more than a Carcase or Image of Unity, without uniting Love (which is its Soul?) Whether all Union in Evil, or in unnecessary Circumstantials, which is managed to the diminution of Christian Love, are any more to the Church, than as the Glory of adorned Cloathing, or Monuments, or Pictures to a Carcase? [*Ib. p. 66.*]



Q. 45. Whether Love and Unity (which the most zealous for human Impositions cannot but commend) would teach Men to tyrannize over Inferiors, to contrive the treading down of others that they may rise, and to keep them down to secure their own Domination; to oppress the Poor, Weak, or Innocent, to make Snares for other Mens Consciences, or to lay Stumbling-blocks before them, to occasion them to Sin, or to drive them on to sin against Conscience, and so to Hell, to shew Mens Authority (about things they call indifferent, or) in a thing of nought? [*Way of Concord*, p. 36.] Would not true Love end our greatest Differences, if Men loved their Neighbours without dissimbling, as themselves; and did but as they would be done by? [*Second Plea for Peace*, p. 156. § 37.] Yea, if many of the Children of the Church were injudiciously scrupulous, when fear of Sin and Hell was the Cause, whether a tender Pastor would not abate them a Ceremony in such a case, when his abating it hath no such danger? [*Ib.* § 38.]

Q. 46. Whether Unmerciful Pastors do not tempt the People to question, whether they be sent of God? Whether the People will not judge of Pastors, as *Solomon* of the true Mother of the Child; that the Merciful and Loving is the true Pastor, and the Hurtful is the Usurper? [*Ib.* p. 156, 157. § 39.]

Q. 47. Whether they that can bear with such as understand not the Essentials of Christianity, and with Drunkards, Swearers, Fornicators, &c. in their constant Congregations and Communion; and yet will not bear with an honest godly Christian, that differeth from their way of Worship in no greater matter than a Ceremony, have not something more amiss within than a Ceremony? [*Ib.* p. 162. §. 48.] And whether the Souls of such, as some call humorous, peevish, or wilful, be not worth more than some of that they call their Liberty? worth more than a needless Ceremony? [*Judgment of Non-conformists in second Plea*, p. 66. q. 5.]

Q. 48. Whether as every Hypocrite would be very Religious, so far as He can subject the true common Religion to his own Interest and Lusts; so every Enemy of Peace will not seem zealous for Peace, so that his own Peace be made the Rule of the common Peace, that all Men be brought to center in his Interests, and take their Peace on his Terms, from him? [*Second Plea*, &c. p. 149.]

Q. 49. Whether all the Arguments for Unity and Peace, which are made use of against Toleration by Prelatists, and all the mischiefs of division which they aggravate, do not principally fall on themselves, if it proves that they are the greatest causes of Division, and hinderers of Church-Concord? [*Ib.* p. 180. § 88.] Whether they do not condemn themselves, who cry down Schism, while they unavoidably cause it? And whether overdoing  
Terms

**Terms of Church-Union and Concord be not the certainest Engines of Schism?** [*Way of Concord*, p. 121. § 11.] Is it not a shameful thing to hear and read Mens tragical out-crys against necessary Toleration (which Christianity and Humanity plead for) while they are the causes of that which they exclaim against? If diversity in Religion be such an Evil, whether should Men cause it by their unnecessary Laws and Canons, and making Engines to tear the Church in pieces, which by the antient Simplicity, and commanded mutual Forbearance, would live in such a measure of Love and Peace, as may be here expected? [*Ib.* p. 272.]

Q. 50. Tho it be a Sin not to joyn with a less worthy Minister, and a less orderly Mode of Worship, when we can have no better; yet whether is it not also a Sin to tie our selves ordinarily to such, when we may have better lawfully, that is, *consideratis considerandis*, upon terms whereon it will not do more hurt than good? [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 76.]

Q. 51. Tho it be granted, that such are justly condemned by God, that repent not, tho they had but a Reader: And that they should be thankful for so much in such Churches where they can have no better; yet whether is it in the power of any Man justly to forbid them better, when God provideth it? And whether must they obey such a prohibition, as such? (Tho Prudence may discern forbearance to be a Duty, when the hurt would be greater than the good.) [*First Plea for Peace*, p. 85.]

Q. 52. Whether Parish-Bounds of Churches be of Divine Institution, and unchangeable, or only of human prudential Constitution? [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 10.] Can any Proof be produced, that ever God determined, the Churches should necessarily be individuated by Parish-Bounds, or Limits of Ground; and that Men in the same Limits might not have divers Bishops, and be of divers particular Churches? [*First Plea, &c.* p. 13.] Whether is such a distribution of Parishes, a thing of absolute necessity to a Church, or only as the general Rules of Order and Edification do ordinarily in Christian Kingdoms require it? And whether can we be bound to such humane distribution against any of Christ's own Laws and Predeterminations; or when any changes turn them against the good Ends for which they are made? Whether can humane Church-Laws bind to Obedience, when they are notoriously against the Laws of Christ, or against the Common Good, or are made by Usurpation without Authority thereto? [*Ibid.* p. 31, 32.]

Q. 53. Whether are the Bishops that dwell in London-Parishes (or others) Members of the Parish-Church where they dwell? If not, whether dwelling in the Parish makes a Christian a Member of the Parish-Church? If not, what makes a Member, and how are the Pastors special Flock truly known to him from others? If the Bishops be Members, Doth



the Canon that forbids Men to go from their own Parish-Churches, extend to the Bishop? And to whom shall we present the Bishop for not coming to Church, or for his Crimes? What? to himself? [*Defence of the Plea for Peace*, p. 110, 111.]

Q. 54. Whether a Ministry be not ordinarily necessary to the propagating of the Gospel, and the saving of Souls? (See *Rom.* 10. 14, 15.) [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 9.] If Men can spare the Ministry, why are they maintained? If they are needful for the safety of Mens Souls, must so many thousands hazard their Souls, for want of needful help? [*Ans. to Dr. Stil. Serm.* p. 52. or 54.] And whether is there not need of a far greater number of Assistants, than all the present Non-conformists? [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 10.] And what harm is there in the Non-conformists preaching, where the tenth Person cannot come to Church, if they would? [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 12.] And what may we think of such, as had rather 10000 Persons stayed idly at home, or went to Sports or Drinking, in *Stepny-Parish*, or *Giles Cripple-gate*, or *Sepulchers*, or *Martins in the Fields*, &c. than that any Non-conformists should preach to them? (See *1 Thess.* 2. 15, 16.) [*ib.* p. 13.] When in *London* it is conjectured that not above the 7th or 8th part of the Inhabitants can come to hear in the outer Parishes, and if the other 6 or 7 parts should seek for room in the emptier Churches within the Walls, it cannot be supposed that above one part of those 6 or 7 would find room: and so if all be set together, it may be supposed that there is place but for about the 5th or 4th part at most of all the People in all the Parish-Churches within and without the Walls: and *London* is to be denominated rather from three, four, or five parts than from one of these: and the great Parishes, where one of twenty cannot hear, are far off from the Churches that have room, and those that have most need, have least desire of the Means; *Quare*, Whether the famousst and happiest City for Religion in the World should thus be left to turn Infidels, Pagans, Atheists, or be kept from all publick Worship of God? [*First Plea, &c.* p. 230.] And whether most great Parishes (especially in Cities and great Towns) have not more Souls which call for ministerial help, than Conformists and Non-conformists, if they lovingly joined, are well able to afford necessary help to? [*ib.* p. 229.]

Q. 55. Whether many in place are not grossly defective in the necessary Qualifications for their Office, (and consequently in the discharge of the same?) [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 10.] And can any Man prove, that if the Parish-Minister cannot, or will not baptize his Children, he must not get another to do it, yea, a prohibited Minister, rather than they should be unbaptized; and yet that if the Parish-Church cannot receive him, or the Pastor cannot, or will not do the Office of a Pastor for him, he must be without

Preach-

Preaching, Worshipping God, and Pastoral oversight? [*First Plea, &c.* p. 103.] And when the Bishops hold it a Duty to avoid a Non-conformist that hath not their License; is there not as much to be said for avoiding a wicked Priest, who (it is sure) hath not Christ's License, and is a Non-conformist to his Laws? [*Ib.* p. 111.] When Pope *Nicholas* and some of the Popish Councils forbid all Men to hear Mass from a fornicating Priest, whether should not Protestants be as strict? And whether is it not as lawful to depart from the Parish-Priest for being a Drunkard, a Scornor at Godliness, a Persecutor, an insufficient Guide of Souls, as for being a Fornicator? And whether many Councils do not forbid hearing Hereticks? [*Way of Concord, third Part, p. 8. §. 20.*]

Q. 56. Whether this Argument be not good, our necessity requireth Pastoral oversight, and Christ commandeth us to use it, when we may have it: But from this publick Minister we cannot have it: Therefore we must seek it where we can? [*First Plea, &c.* p. 100.] And whether People are not deprived of Pastoral oversight as from the allowed Minister, 1. When publick Pastors are at so great a distance from them, as that such Pastors cannot come to them, nor they and their Families go so far, without such cost and pains and loss of time as will deprive them of the Benefit. 2. When Parishes are so great that the allowed Pastors cannot preach to half, or a fourth, or tenth part, and cannot visit half the sick, &c. 3. Where the allowed Pastors are so slothful or proud, that they will not condescend to such Offices of personal Help as the People have need of, especially to the poorer sort. 4. Where they are young, raw, or ignorant, unable to counsel People, as their necessities require in order to their Salvation. 5. Where they are so profane and malignant, that if poor People come to them with Cases of Conscience, or for Counsel what they must do to be Saved, they will but deride them, and would make them believe that to be solicitous about Salvation, and afraid of Sinning, and seriously Godly, is but to be Hypocrites, Melancholly or Mad. 6. Where they are Heretical, and not to be trusted in point of Faith? When in any of these Cases the People, or part of them are deprived of that Pastoral Help, which their necessity requireth, and God commandeth, whether may they not seek it where they can best have it? [*Ib.* p. 100, 101, 102.] Whether many Souls are not like to be fed, or famished, and consequently to live or die, as Non-conformists do their Duty, or neglect it? [*Sacril. Desert. p. 84.*] And whether if the poor were famishing about us, any Law of Mans can disoblige us from relieving them? [*Ib.* p. 85.]

Q. 57. If they that are vowed to the Ministry, are bound to exercise the Ministry (and otherwise would be sacrilegious and cruel to Souls) can they preach without Auditors? And can those Auditors be no Congregation? [*Ib.* p. 70.]



Q. 58. Where both the ejected and imposed Minister are fit Persons, whether may not the People take them both conjunctly for their Pastors, each administering to the same Church according to their various Liberties and Capacities? [*ib.* p. 11.]

Q. 59. If Conformists generally would set themselves to preach and pray in a sound and serious, holy manner, and encourage and promote Piety in the People, and willingly accept of all the Help they could get here; if they endeavoured to do God and his Church more Service than those that went before them, whether they would not be more honoured, at least by the better sort (and that deservedly) than ever they must look to be for Rigidness about Ceremonies, &c. Whether Godliness be not that which godly People most care for? [*ibid.* p. 126.]

Q. 60. Whether would they have People taught, reformed, saved, or not? If yea, would they not have necessary help to do it? (If not; are such fit to be Ministers of Christ?) And does that Man truly know what it is to be a Minister, or a Christian, that perceives not a necessity of Help, if he can have it? (*ibid.* p. 129.) And if things in *England* were once brought to that pass, that really our Labour would be unnecessary in the Judgment of those that are not Intdels, Ignorants or malignant Enemies of an holy Life, whether need any fear coming to loss, if they were bound for us, that we would presently gratify all, that desire our Silence, or Banishment, rather than trouble Men with needless Work? [*ib.* p. 134.]

Q. 61. Whether is it the Paucity of ignorant and ungodly Souls, or the great Number, Ability, Zeal, and Diligence of the Conformists, that makes the Labours of others needless? Or what are their Thoughts of Souls, of Sin, of Repentance, of Holiness, and of their own Sufficiency and Labours? [*Ib.* p. 57.] As of old every single Church had usually many Presbyters and Deacons with the Bishop; so is it not undeniable, that many of our Parishes have Work enough for many Ministers? And whether the only thing pretended for our present Paucity be not the want of Maintenance (with the want of worthy Men?) [*First Plea &c.* p. 227.]

Q. 62. Whether then might it not have been expected of such as needed and desired the help of their Brethren, that long ere this they should have petitioned Rulers for the Liberty of their Ministry (when all knew that there was no Hope their own petitioning should have Success?) Whether might they not have humbly acquainted our Rulers, That all our Labours conjoynd are too little; that they needed our Help, and the ignorant our Teaching; that their Judgment was, our Ministry is more necessary than our personal Conformity? And whether should not Ministers of all Men have been most sensible of the Churches Breaches, Loss and  
Danger,

Danger, and most compassionate over Peoples Souls? [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 135.] And whether had they not healed all our Breaches, if they had petitioned, and prevailed but for these two things, viz. 1. That the door of Entrance might not have been barred by any other Subscriptions, Professions or Oaths, than what were used in the Churches of Christ, till the Exaltation of the Papacy ( for 600 Years ) besides the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, and the subscribing the Doctrine of the Church of England in the 39 Articles, according to the 13th of Queen Elizabeth. 2. That those ( so subscribing ) who dare not use the Liturgy and Ceremonies, might have leave to preach in the Churches which use them, under Laws which shall restrain them from all unpeaceable Opposition to what they dare not use, or to the Government of the Church? [*ibid.* p. 136, 137.] And what but a spirit of Envy, or a carnal Interest, cross to the Interest of Christ and Mens Salvation, should grudge at their Preaching, while they are responsible for all they say, or do amiss? [*First Plea*, &c. p. 249.]

Q. 63. Whether the Accusers of the *Non-conformists*, who feign strange things of them relating to Doctrine and Government ( which they do not own ) do not, 1. Hereby render them contemptible and odious, as brain-sick Persons, who keep up a dividing Faction, in spite of the Light and Obligation of the common Principles of Humanity and Society? 2. And do they not hereby imprint the Stamp of Satan, viz. the hatred of their Brethren on the minds of such Hearers as will believe them, and receive the Impress? 3. And do they not hereby fill Families, Cities and Countries with all that Spawn of ugly Sins, which are the Genuine Fruits of such Hatred and Contempt; and keep Men also from Repentance for any thing that they have said or done ( how cruelly soever ) against such Ministers and others, that are represented as so odious to them? 4. And do they not hereby fortify the Peoples Souls against receiving converting, or edifying Instruction by such accused Ministers? 5. And do they not thus furnish Papists, Infidels, and other Adversaries with matter of Accusation against one part of the Ministers and Servants of Christ &c. [*Judgment of Non-conformists in Second Plea for Peace.* p. 21, 22.] And whether is it not diabolical, for any to be angry, if ( as we have Opportunity ) we so far undeceive the People, as to acquaint them with our Judgment, and the Untruth of what they have believed of us? [*ibid.* p. 85.] And whether we may not suppose, that Satan is afraid of their Ministry who hath stirred up so much Opposition against it? [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 84.]

Q. 64. Whether Popery will come in ever the more for *Non-conformist's* Preaching? ( Whether such will preach for, or against it? ) Or ever the less, if they renounce their Ministry? [*ibid.* p. 82.] Whether they that  
cry



cry out of the danger of Popery, Infidelity, Prophaness and Heresies; and yet had rather let them all in, then give us leave to exercise that Ministry to which we were consecrated, in Poverty and Subjection; and while they cry out of Divisions, will not lay by the dividing Engines; should rather accuse us, or themselves, if the Evils overwhelm us, which they seem to fear? [*ibid.* p. 137, 138.]

Q. 65. When any are unjustly cast out of their Parish-Churches, whether all Ministers are thereupon obliged, or allowed to desert, or neglect them? [*ib.* p. 21.]

Q. 66. If a Patient would not take a Medicine from one Mans hand, whether would not the Physician consent that another should give it him? Whether would the Father let the Infant famish, if it would take Food from none but its Mother? And whether would there be need of the best Conformists, as Ministers, if the People had no Faults, or Weaknesses? [*ibid.* p. 125, 126.] What if they culpably would hear no other? Is it better to let them hear none at all, than that we preach to them? [*Answer*, to Dr. Stil. *Serm.* p. 59. or 61.]

Q. 67. Whether it be not one thing to deny total Communion with a Church, and another to separate but *secundum quid*, for some Act, or Part? Whether it be not one thing to separate locally by bodily Absence, and another mentally by Schismatical Principles? Whether it be not one thing to depart wilfully, and another to be unwillingly cast out? Whether it be not one thing to depart rashly and in hast, and another to depart after due Patience, when Reformation appears hopeless [*First Plea*, &c. p. 38, 39.]

Q. 68. When the publick Good requires *Non-conformists* to hold distinct Assemblies, for Assistance in Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline, as near as they can according to the Will of God, to further, not to disgrace or hinder the honest Parish-ministers, whether are these separate Churches, any more than Chappels be? Or distinct Churches, more than *secundum quid*, holding personal Communion in a godly Conversation with the rest of the Christians in the Parish, and also sometimes assembling with them? [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 22, 23.] Or whether those that do their best to keep up the Reputation of the publick conformable Ministry, to further Love and Concord, and the success of their Labours with the People; and profess to take their own Assemblies but as Chappels, and not as distinct, much less as separated Churches; yea, and those who do administer Sacraments, and do that which is like the Separatist's Way; yet do it not on their Principles, but *pro tempore*, till God shall give them Opportunity to serve him in the established Way (it being reformed, or well ordered Parish-Churches, under the Government and Countenance of the Christian

Christian Magistrates, which are most agreeable to their Desires) whether such (I say) are justly accounted Separatists? [*First Plea &c.* p. 246.]

Q. 69. Whether we may not set up other Churches, when we are necessarily kept from those established by publick Power? [*Ib.* p. 77.]

Q. 70. Whether it be Schism to preach, and gather Churches, and elect and ordain Pastors, and assemble for God's Worship against the Laws and Will of Heathen, Mahometan, or Infidel Princes that forbid it; as the Christians did for 300 Years? And if there be the same Cause and Need, whether it be any more Schism to do it against the Laws and Will of a Christian Prince? For, 1. Are not Christ's Laws equally obligatory? 2. Are not Souls equally precious? 3. Is not the Gospel and God's Worship equally necessary? 4. And doth his Christianity enable him to do more Hurt than a Pagan may do, or more Good? [*Ibid.* p. 51, 52.]

Q. 71. If Competent Pastors be set over half the Parishes in a Kingdom, and the other half hath incompetent Men; or if nine Parts of a Kingdom were competently supplied, and but the tenth Part had not such set over them, to whom the People may lawfully commit the Pastoral Care of their Souls, whether is it Schism, or whether is it not a Duty for those that are destitute, to get the best Supply they can? And whether is it Schism, or whether is it not a Duty for faithful Ministers, though forbidden by Superiours, to perform their Office to such People that desire it? [*Ibid.* p. 83.] If the Magistrate appoint 20000, or 10000, or one half of a Parish to be excluded for want of Room, and Teachers, is it not ill supposed that the Gospel is truly and sufficiently preached to them, to whom it is not preached at all? Or doth it prove it not necessary to them, that it is preached to others? [*Ans. to Dr. Stil. Sermon.* p. 22.] And whether is not the general Ordination of Ministers with the Peoples Necessity and Consent, added to God's general Commands to all his Ministers, to be faithful and diligent, a sufficient obliging Call to such Ministration, without the Will of (prohibiting) Superiours, yea, against it? And otherwise doth it not follow, that it is at the Will of a Man, whether Souls shall be saved or damned? (for how shall they believe, unless they hear? And how shall they hear without a Preacher?) and at the Will of Man, whether Christ shall have a Church, and God be publicly worshipped, or not? [*First Plea, &c.* p. 48.] And whether doth not the indispenfible Law of Nature oblige every Man according to his Place and Calling, his Ability, and Opportunities, to do his best to propagate Christ's Gospel, and to save Mens Souls, as much and more than to feed Mens Bodies and save their Lives? And whether are not Ministers specially obliged to do it (by their Calling) as Ministers of Christ, thereto devoted? [*Ibid.*]



( 122 )

Q. 72. There being so many sorts of Churches in the World, (as Universal, National, Patriarchal, Provincial, or Metropolitcal, Dioceſan, Claſſical, Parochial, Congregational ) whether muſt it not be hard to give a juſt Deciſion of the Queſtion, [ From which of theſe, and when it is a Sin to ſeparate? ] till it be firſt known, which of theſe is of Divine, and which of Humane Inſtitution? and which Humane Churches are neceſſary, which Lawful, and which Sinful? (*ibid.* p. 7.) How is it proved, and how cometh it to be any great matter to ſeparate from a Church-Form which God never made? [ *Anſw. to Dr. Still. Sermon.* p 33. ]

Q. 73. Whether they that ſay thoſe Species ( National, Patriarchal, Provincial, Dioceſan ) are of God, muſt not prove that God inſtituted them in Scripture; or elſe that he gave ſome Men power to inſtitute them ſince Scripture-times? And till the ſame be proved, whether are any bound to obey them, at leaſt when they over-rule Chriſt's own Inſtitutions? (*Way of Concord*, p. 111. §. 15.) And whether to deviſe new Species of Churches without God's Authority, and impoſe them on the World ( in his Name ) and call all Diſſenters Schiſmaticks, be not a far worſe Uſurpation, than to make and impoſe new Ceremonies, or Liturgies? (*ibid.* §. 16.)

Q. 74. Whether a Society of Neighbour-Chriſtians associated with a Paſtor, or Paſtors, for perſonal Communion in holy Doctrine, Diſcipline, and Worſhip, be not a Church Form of Divine Inſtitution? (*First Plea, &c.* p. 8.) And whether any Proof hath ever been produced, that many Churches of this firſt Rank, muſt ( of Duty ) make one fixed, greater, compound Church by Association, as Dioceſan, National, &c. and that God hath inſtituted any ſuch Form? Whether the greateſt Defenders of Prelacy do not affirm ſuch to be but humane Inſtitutions? (*ib.* p. 12, 13.) Whether ever any ſatisfactory Proof hath been brought, that ever Chriſt or his Apoſtles did inſtitute any particular Church (taken in a political Senſe, as organized, and not meerly for a Community) without a Biſhop, or Paſtor, who had the Power of teaching them, ruling them by the Word, and Power of the Church-keys, and leading them in publick Worſhip? (*ibid.* p. 13.) And whether hath it yet been proved, that any one Church of this firſt Rank (which was not an Association of Churches) conſiſted in Scripture-times of many ( much leſs of many ſcores or hundreds ) ſuch fixed Churches or Congregations? Or that any one Biſhop of the firſt Rank ( that was not an Apoſtle, or Biſhop of Biſhops ) had more than one of ſuch fixed Societies, or Churches under him; or might have more ſtated Members of his Church than were capable of perſonal Communion, and mutual Aſſiſtance at due Seasons, in holy Doctrine, Diſcipline, and Worſhip? As now there are many Chappels in ſome Pariſhes, whoſe Proximity

Proximity and Relation to the Parish-Churches make them capable of personal Communion in due seasons with the whole Parish ( at least *per vices* ) in those Churches, and in their Conversation; and as a single Congregation may prudently, in Persecution, or foul Weather, meet oft-times in several Houses; so why might not the great Church of *Jerusalem* ( which yet cannot be proved a quarter so big as some of our Parishes ) hold their publick Meetings oft at the same time in divers Houses, when they had no Temples, and yet be capable of personal Communion, as before described? [ *ibid.* p. 13, 14. ] And when the learned Dr. *Hammond* on 1 *Tim.* 3. saith, The Church of the Living God, was every such regular Assembly of Christians under a Bishop ( such as *Timothy* was ) an *Oeconomus* set over them by Christ, &c. doth he not here suppose ( as he elsewhere sheweth ) that *de facto*, Episcopal Churches were in Scripture-times but single Congregations? Then whether is the new Form of Congregations *jure divino*, when they become but parts of a Bishops Church? And may we not query the same of the new Form of a Diocesan Church? ( *ibid.* p. 5, 6. ) And doth not *Ignatius* expressly make one Altar, and one Bishop with Presbyters and Deacons, to be the Note of a Church's Unity and Individuation? ( Whence learned Mr. *Joseph Mede* doth argue it, as certain, that then a Bishop's Church was no other than such as usually communicated in one place ) ( *ibid.* p. 17. ) And see ( *Ans. to Dr. Still. Serm.* p. 75. or 69. )

Q. 75. And seeing it cannot be proved, that God hath instituted any other than Congregational, or Parochial Churches ( as for present Communion ) wheher must it not follow, that none of the ~~rest~~ instituted by Man, have Power to deprive such single Churches of any of the Priviledges granted them by Christ? And whereas Christ hath made the Terms of Catholick Communion himself, and hath commanded all such to worship him publicly in holy Communion under faithful Pastors, chosen, or at least consented to by themselves ( which was the Judgment of the Churches many hundred Years ) whether can any humane Order or Power deprive them of any of this Benefit, or disoblige them from any of this Duty, by just Authority? ( *Way of Concord*, p. 111. §. 13. )

Q. 76. Then if any Prince would turn his Kingdom, or a whole Province into one only Church; and thereby overthrow all the first Order of Churches of Christ's Institution, which are associated for personal present Communion, allowing them no Pastors that have the Power of the Keys, or all essential to their Office; though he should allow Parochial Oratories, or Chappels, which should be no true Churches, but parts of a Church; Whether were it Schism to gather Churches within such a Church, against the Laws of such a Prince? ( *First Plea*, &c. p. 52. ) Or whether hath



God made such proper Judges, whether Christ should have Churches according to his Laws, or whether God should be worshipped, and Souls saved, or his own Institution of Churches be observed? (*Ibid.* p. 53.)

Q. 77. And if any Persons shall pretend to have the Power of governing the Churches, and Inferiour Pastors, as their Bishops, who are obtruded on those Churches, without the Election, or Consent of the People, or inferiour Pastors, and these Bishops shall by Laws, or Mandates forbid such Assembling, Preaching, or Worship as otherwise would be Lawful and a Duty; whether is it Schism to disobey such Laws, or Mandates, as such? (*ibid.* p. 80.) Bishop *Bilson* (of *Subject*. p. 399.) grants, [The Election of Bishops in those days belonged to the People, and not to the Prince; and though *Valens* by plain force placed *Lucius* there; yet might the People lawfully reject him, as no Bishop, and cleave to *Peter* their right Pastor.] (*ibid.* p. 79.) And however in some Cases the Advantages of some imposed Persons may make it an Act of Prudence, and so a Duty to consent; yet whether are such truly the Bishops of such Churches, till they do consent? (*ibid.* p. 80.) Hath not this been taken for their Right given them by God? And doth not Dr. *Blondel* (*de jure Plebis in Reg. Eccl.*) beyond Exception prove it, with more? (*ib.* p. 81.) Therefore if Bishops that have no Foundation of such Relative Power, shall impose inferiour Pastors on the Parish-Churches, and command the Peoples Acceptance and Obedience; whether are the People bound to accept and obey them by any Authority that is in that Command, as such? Or whether is it Schism to disobey it? (*ibid.* p. 82.)

Q. 78. Whether doth it not follow from the Principles of the Diocesan, that holdeth a Bishop is Essential to a Church, and consequently that we have no more Churches than Diocesses, That he who separateth from a Parish-Church, separates from no Church? (*Sacril. Desert.* p. 24.)

Q. 79. Whether we should not more justly deserve the term of Schismatics, if we renounced Communion with all other Churches, except Parochial and Conformists? And whose Conscience should sooner accuse him of Schism? Whether ours, that resolve to hold Communion seasonably with all true Christian Churches among us, that teach not Heresy, nor preach down Holiness, &c. and deny us not their Communion, unless we will sin? or a Conformists, that will hold Communion with none but his own Party, but separates from all other Churches in the Land? [*Ib.* p. 41.] Is he a greater Separatist that confesseth them to be a true Church, and their Communion lawful; but preferreth another as fitter for him: or he that denieth Communion with true worshipping Assemblies, as unlawful to be communicated with, when it is not so? If the former, then will it not follow, that condemning them as no Church, is a Diminution, or no Aggravation.

Aggravation of Separation, and the local presence of an Infidel, or Scornor, would be a less separate state, than the absence of their Friends? If the latter (which is certain) then will it not follow, that if we can prove the Assemblies lawful which they condemn, they are the true Separatists that condemn them, and deny Communion with them, declaring it unlawful? [*Answ. to Dr. Stil. Sermon. p. 47, or 49.*]

Q. 80. And whether is not the Separation of whole Churches much worse than of single Persons from one Church, when it is upon unwarrantable Cause, or Reasons? [*Ib. p. 31.*] (Now, how many of the Dissenters frequently communicate with them, while they generally refuse, shun, and condemn our Assemblies?) Are there no true Churches to be found in the World, that have no Bishops (of a superior order over Pastors?) And were there not true Churches in *England* in that long Interval of Episcopal Government? And are not they as justly to be charged with Schism, and Separation from those true Churches, which were before the re-establishment of Episcopacy, as they that are commonly charged by those Encroachers, and Invaders of other Mens Rights? [*Vid. Sacril. Desert. p. 60.*]

Q. 81. Seeing the Universal Church is certainly the highest Species, whether have any Authority, on pretence of narrower Communion in lower Churches, to change Christ's terms of Catholick Communion, or to deprive Christians of the right of being loved and received by each other, or to disoblige them from the duty of loving and receiving each other? Whether can humane Power made by their own Contracts, change Christ's Laws, or the Priviledges or Forms of Christ's own Churches? [*Way of Concord, p. 111. §. 14.*]

Q. 82. Whether the greatest and commonest Schism be not by dividing Laws and Canons, which causlessly silence Ministers, scatter Flocks, and decree the unjust Excommunication of Christians, and deny Communion to those that yield not to sinful, or unnecessary, ill-made Terms of Communion? [*ibid. third Part, p. 13. §. 43.*] And if any proud, passionate, or erroneous Person do, as *Diotrephes*, cast out the Brethren undeservedly, by unjust Suspensions, Silencings, or Excommunications, whether this be not tyrannical Schism? [*First Plea, &c, p. 41.*] And as we say of the Papists, that they unjustly call those Men Schismatics, whom they first cast out themselves by unjust Excommunication; may we not say so of any others? especially if either for that which is a Duty, or for some small mistake, which is not in the Persons power to rectify, no greater than most good Christians are guilty of, their Church-Law says, he shall be excommunicate *ipso facto*? (*ibid. p. 104.*) See also [*Answ. to Dr. Stil. Sermon. p. 47, or 49. §. 8.*]



Q. 83. Whether making sinful Terms of Communion, imposing things forbidden by God on those that will have Communion with them, and expelling those that will not so sin, whether this be not heinous Schism? [*First Plea, &c.* p. 41, 42.]

Q. 84. Whether all those would not be deeply guilty of such Schism, who by talk, writing or preaching justify and cry it up, and draw others into the Guilt, and reproach the Innocent as Schismatics for not offending God? [*Ib.*]

Q. 85. If any will confine the Power or Exercise of the Church-Keys into so few Hands, as shall make the Exercise of Christ's Discipline impossible; or shall make Churches so great, or Pastors so few, as that the most of the People must needs be without Pastoral Oversight, Teaching and publick Worship, and then will forbid those People to commit the care of their Souls to any other, that would be Pastors indeed, and so would compel them to live without Christ's Ordinances, true Church-Communion, and Pastoral Help, whether this would not be Schismatical, and much worse? [*Ib.* p. 44.]

Q. 86. When able faithful Pastors are lawfully set over the Assemblies, by just Election and Ordination, if any will causelessly and without Right silence them, and command the People to desert them, and to take to others (for their Pastors) in their stead, of whom they have no such knowledge, as may encourage them to such a change; Whether this can be defended from the charge of Schism? (As *Cyprian* in the case of *Novatian* says, that he could be no Bishop, because another was rightful Bishop before.) [*Ib.* p. 49, 50.]

Q. 87. Whether the way to heal us be not, 1. To approve the best, 2. To tolerate the tolerable, 3. To have Sacraments free, and not forced, 4. To restrain the Intolerable, 5. This to be the Test of Toleration, Whether such tolerated Worship do more good or hurt, in true impartial Judgment, 6. Magistrates keeping all in Peace? [*Way of Concord, third Part,* p. 144.]

Q. 88. Whether it be not a weakning of the King's Interest, to divide his Subjects, and build up unnecessary Walls of Partition between them, and to keep them in such Divisions; seeing a Kingdom divided against it self cannot stand? And whether it be not unsafe and uncomfortable to a Prince to rule a divided mutinous People; but sweet and safe to rule them that are united in mutual Love? Whether they that would lay the Peoples Concord upon uncapable Terms, would not bring the King's Interest in his Peoples Love, and willing Obedience, and ready Defence of him into too narrow a Bottom, making him the King of some causelessly divided and espoused

poused Party, which must be set up to the Oppression of all the rest, who are as wise and just, and loyal as they? [*Second Plea, &c.* p. 76. §. 24.]

*Si in necessariis sit Unitas,  
In Non-necessariis Libertas,  
In utrisq; Charitas,  
Optimo certe loco essent res nostræ.*

To make a rounder number I may add, from Mr. M. Godwyn his [*Negro's and Indians Advocate*] pleading for the Instructing of them, and so admitting them into the Church (a Book lately Printed, and Dedicated to the Arch Bishop of Canterbury.)

Q. 89. Whether 'Is the wilful neglecting and opposing of it, (as he 'says in the Title-Page) no less than a manifest Apostacy from the Christi-  
'an Faith? Can no Christian ever justify his omitting any possible lawful  
'Means for the Advancement of his Religion? (as he says, p. 91.) Are all  
professed Christians absolutely bound in their Places to endeavour the same,  
by their Vow in Baptism, and their very Profession?

Q. 90. Then are they not bound in their Places to endeavour the Advancement of Religion, as well at home, as abroad? And do they not owe as much Service herein (for Christ's sake) towards their own Countrymen, as towards Strangers? Should not *English-men* be as well concerned for *English-men*, as for *Indians*? And when the State of Religion is so visibly declining in *England* (Atheism, Ignorance, Error, Profaneness, Poverty and Superstition encreasing and getting up so fast amongst us) is he for any great Advancement of Religion, that would send away all Non-conformists (if there be thousands of them) to his *Negro's* and *Indians*, for this wise Reason, that 'There is no want of their Labours at home?

## F I N I S.

### A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

**T**He Reader is desired to take notice that these Papers were sent to *London*, by the Author, on the latter end of *February*, or beginning of *March* last, but by reason of the multitude of Pamphlets, they could not get through the Press sooner.

The Ingenious Reader is also desired to pass by the *Errata*, the Author being remote from the Press, these few he hath observed in some of the Sheets he hath seen, viz.

### E R R A T A.

**P**Age 5. l. 6. r. above. P. 20. l. 24. r. do you not. P. 21. l. 12. r. Wages. P. 22. l. 22. r. Contrarywise. P. 23. l. 24. r. and. P. 24. l. 18. dele, down. P. 28. l. i. r. Triarios. P. 57. l. 6. r. single-foal'd. P. 62. l. 29. r. excite greater. P. 63. l. 24. r. Church. P. 70. l. 30. r. Inobedientia. P. 72. l. 19, 20. r. betray. P. 81. l. 35. r. for. P. 83. l. 36. r. did he at all.



Page 1. The first of the Opinions of all the judges who  
[illegible text]

[illegible text]

TABLE

ADVERTISING  
[illegible text]

[illegible text]